


APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Idaho State Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: PO Box 83720 Boise, Idaho 83720-0027</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Steve Underwood</p> <p>Position and Office: Director, Statewide System of Support Division of Student Achievement & School Improvement</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: PO Box 83720 Boise, Idaho 83720-0027</p> <p>Telephone: (208) 332-6922</p> <p>Fax: (208) 334-2228</p> <p>Email address: sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Thomas Luna, Superintendent of Public Instruction</p>	<p>Telephone: (208) 332-6800</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X </p>	<p>Date: 12/2/2010</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

School Improvement Grants Application

Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Fiscal Year 2010
CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name:Idaho



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202



OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: school.improvement.grants@ed.gov

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at carlas.mccauley@ed.gov.

FY 2010 Application Instructions

Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.

Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.

We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.

SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Idaho State Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: PO Box 83720 Boise, Idaho 83720-0027
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Steve Underwood Position and Office: Director, Statewide System of Support Division of Student Achievement & School Improvement Contact's Mailing Address: PO Box 83720 Boise, Idaho 83720-0027 Telephone: (208) 332-6922 Fax: (208) 334-2228 Email address: sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Thomas Luna, Superintendent of Public Instruction	Telephone:
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver) <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	

SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

☒ Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009

For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:

☐ Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010

For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:

☒ 1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.

☐ *SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)*

☐ 2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.

☐ 3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.

☐ 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.

Insert definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or link to definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” here:

Please see Attachment 1. The definition remains unchanged from the FY 2009 SIG application.

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.

☒ **SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.**

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Part 2: The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

☐ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Below are the criteria the Idaho SDE will use to evaluate district applications.

Part 1

(1). The first evaluation will be an analysis of the process the district used to select the reform model proposed for each Tier I and Tier II school. The district's application will be assessed based on the extent to which the district:

- Used the recommended resources provided by the SDE:
 - Capacity Builder
 - The Center on Education Effectiveness Perceptual Surveys
 - Focus Visits-curriculum and instructional audits provided by SDE team
 - State level assessments (Idaho Reading Indicator, Primary Math Assessment, Direct Writing Assessment, Direct Math Assessment, Idaho Standard Achievement Test).
- Reviewed and referenced the state's online strategic school improvement tool, Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE Tool). The tool was developed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement.
- Local interim and formative assessments.
- Teacher qualifications and placement.
- Distribution of highly qualified teachers.
- Budget, including per pupil expenses.
- Revisited prior attempts by the LEA to engage in school improvement activities.
- Addressed areas identified in the District Level Improvement plan that might impede or enhance the school(s) ability to implement necessary changes.
- Engaged relevant stakeholders groups, including:
 - Local education associations regarding teacher evaluation and assignments (evidence may include a memorandum of understanding and/or timeline for collaboration on matters related to contracts, schedules, school reform, evaluation, policies, procedures).
 - Local School Board Members.
 - Parents of students both within schools in Tiers I and II as well as all schools within the LEA.
 - Community partners.

(2). The second evaluation will be an analysis of the district's demonstration of their **capacity**, willingness, and commitment (with assistance from the SDE) to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources, leadership, and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the district's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention model in each school. Each district's application must

demonstrate commitment to build capacity in the following areas:

- Demonstrates the capacity necessary to implement the selected intervention model in its Tier I or Tier II schools as defined in “Section C: Capacity” below.
- Develop the necessary infrastructure to support change at both the school and district level (i.e., a district leadership team and the creation of a district liaison/lead partner position that is directly responsible for the implementation of the selected model within Tier I and Tier II schools, plan to review district policies, procedures, and manuals during the coming school year, system in place to review interim assessment data at each of the schools, etc.).
- Identified district leader’s attendance at all SDE sponsored professional development workshops.
- Willingness to partner with external technical assistance providers (may include but is not limited to participation in the Idaho Building Capacity Project).
- Creation of a timeline for the implementation of the basic elements of the selected model during the 2011-2012 school year. The district must select a reform model prior to the beginning of the school year and begin implementation of the basic elements of the model at the beginning of the school year. However, certain elements such as job-embedded professional development, identifying and rewarding teachers and principals that have impacted student achievement may occur later in the school year. At a minimum, basic elements, for each model include:
 - Turnaround Model: Replace the principal, grant new principal sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; develop and adopt locally-determined “turnaround” competencies to screen all existing staff, rehiring up to 50% and select new staff; and identify processes for providing increased learning time to students and staff and for designing job-embedded professional development in collaboration with staff. The district will provide timelines indicating its commitments to address the remaining required actions.
 - Restart Model: A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school into a charter school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. Restart models must be implemented in School Year 2011-12 and must enroll, within the grades it serves, any

former student who wishes to attend the school. In Idaho, such a charter school must be authorized under the LEA rather than the Charter School Commission, and the district will hold the EMO responsible for the meeting the final requirements associated with the intervention model. Additional information regarding the process of conversion may be obtained at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/. (Note: A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.) **While federal guidance does not require it, Idaho State policy requires that it is mandatory for any CMO or EMO that enters into an agreement to operate a Tier I or II school must attend state sponsored professional development offered by the State Department of Education.**

- School Closure: Establish a timeline for school closure and reassign students to other higher-achieving schools within the district.
- Transformation Model: Replace the principal (unless the school has implemented the Transformation Model in the last two years, including assigning a new principal); grant principal sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; provide timeline for identifying and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as with the state content standards, develop schedules for extending learning time, and creating community-oriented schools; and provide plan for ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance from the district and external partners.

A full description of the reform models and required elements can be found on the U.S. Department of Education’s web site <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>

- Provide a description of the process for selecting the new principal and teachers (Aligning staff competencies to student needs).
- Provide evidence of School Board commitment.
- Provide timeline and process to build sufficient district level and school level staff to implement the selected model.
- If applicable, provide evidence from personnel associations with respect to teacher evaluations requirements (consider student achievement as part of the evaluation process).
- If applicable, provide evidence of the availability and qualifications of selected

EMO.

(3). The district's budget includes sufficient funds to implement fully and effectively the selected reform model as well as to support the school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of SIG funds. Applications will be evaluated based on:

- Determining whether or not the budget for each school served falls within the parameters of the SIG final requirements, which may be no less than \$50,000 and no more than \$2 million per year over no more than three years.
- Proposed budget for each Tier I and Tier II school the district is applying to serve.
- Proposed budget for each Tier III school.
- Overall proposed budget, with supporting rationale, indicates how district will allocate school improvement funds over a three year period, with separate budgets for each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it is applying to serve.
- Proposed budget includes a plan for how the improvement efforts will be sustained once the funding period ends.
- If applicable, the proposed budget reflects amounts agreed upon between the district and SDE to provide technical assistance and other support services.

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that the district may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a SIG grant, but most likely they will occur after receiving the grant. The SDE will provide technical assistance and support to implement all or part of the actions listed below.

(1). Each district's application and subsequent monitoring of implementation will be assessed based on the extent to which **the LEA application ensures in Section 3a that the interventions are consistent with the SIG final requirements (with reference to Section 3a of the Scoring Guide) and** addresses the following components:

- Conducted (or commits to conducting) a Focus Visit at both the district and school level (Schools in Tier I and Tier II).
- Describes the district's action to recruit, screen, select, assign, and retain high performing teachers and administrators.
- Describes other district procedures and practices to support full and effective implementation of the reform model (e.g. staffing, calendar/time, budgeting).
- Describes district actions which will promote the continuous use of student data

(e.g. formative, interim, and summative assessments).

- Describes the district actions which will promote the use of classroom walkthroughs by district and school level leaders to inform professional development.
- Describes the process to ensure a clear focus on student learning and communicating and reinforcing high expectations and accountability for teachers/leaders.
- Describes district actions which will ensure both vertical and horizontal curriculum alignment.
- Describe district actions to ensure that each identified Tier I and Tier II school receives ongoing, intensive, technical assistance from central office staff.
- Specifically addresses each “required action” (see attachments 4, 5, 6 for details) on the selected reform model.

(2) LEA applications will be evaluated for the degree to which they recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, based on the following criteria.

- It has been the experience within Idaho that external providers are unlikely to be available in our most rural and remote areas. Thus, Idaho has an established set of approved external partners, such as the Center for School Improvement at BSU, the Intermountain Center for Education Effectiveness at ISU, and others outlined in the LEA Application section: *Descriptions of State Sponsored Improvement Activities*.
- If LEAs apply to utilize external providers that are not already approved, those applications will be evaluated on a case by case basis by the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Leadership Team. LEA proposals for other external providers will be evaluated based on the degree to which they demonstrate:
 - a rigorous and thorough review, or screening, of available external providers
 - a rigorous and thorough bidding process using a high quality RFP, if more than one choice is available
 - that the external provider’s services align with the implementation of the intervention model as defined in the SIG final requirements
 - the external provider is sufficiently qualified to provide the services necessary for implementation of the intervention model
- If found lacking, the SSOS Leadership Team will provide direct support and assistance to LEA leadership in the process of recruiting, screening, and selecting such providers, and then require the application to be revised as

appropriate.

(3). Align resources with the intervention:

- Coordinate resources (in addition to SIG funds) needed to fully implement the selected reform model. Resources may include: personnel assignments, federal, state, and local funding sources and funding from private/public partnerships, technology (data systems, and assessment systems); partnerships with community agencies.
- Describe the systemic process in which the central office and building leaders will work together to analyze, coordinate, blend and align available resources to support the reform model.

(4). LEA applications will be evaluated for the degree to which they modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable full and effective implementation of the reform model based on the following criteria. The application:

- Identifies in Section 3d of the LEA Application, practices and policies such as those identified in Section 3d of the Scoring Guide, and addresses, or as appropriate, modifies policies and practices to enable full and effective implementation of the reform model.
- Identifies a process to review current practices and policies which support or impede reform efforts at the identified Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. Evidence provided by the district may include: timeline for review of current policies and practices; process for annual review and revision of board policies and procedures; opportunity for stakeholder involvement and input; data used to assess implementation of reform model, and impact.
- Identifies processes and policies related to recruiting and retaining highly effective educators to work in the LEA's persistently low-achieving schools.
- Describes processes for intentional, frequent communications between superintendent/district central office and staff in Tier I, II and III schools. (Response should include multiple methods for ongoing communication and opportunities for collaboration.)
- Describes the process to examine system-wide alignment of programs and practices with the reform model. (May include: identification of current programs and practices which may support or impede intervention, description of timeline and data collected, strategies for aligning programs with required actions.)

(5). Sustain the reforms after funding period ends. Describes the system-wide

infrastructures the district has developed, or will develop, to sustain reforms in Tiers I, II and III schools over time. District's response may identify:

- Board adopting policies and practices.
- Systems and supports for Tier I and II schools to sustain changes (designated district liaison, retention of highly effective educators, extended learning time, and new governance model).
- Systems of support for Tier III schools to sustain changes over time.
- Tools, systems, and practices supporting the use of data to inform district, school, and classroom decision making.
- Establishing an annual process for goal setting (within content areas and for both all students and individual subgroups).
- Establishing a process for ongoing job-embedded professional development.
- Calendar and schedule which provides extended learning time (both students and staff).
- System for continued alignment of curriculum.
- Budget which uses federal, state, and local education funding to sustain reform.
- Decision-making processes at the district and school levels which provide for multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement and input.

B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? *(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)*

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

Insert response to Section B-1 Additional Evaluation Criteria here:

(1)

A team of reviewers at the Idaho SDE, located within the Division of Student Achievement & School Improvement, will review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period. This review will occur as part of the regular application approval process using the scoring guide (Attachment 5) that will be used with LEA applications. Pre-implementation budget and activities will thus be reviewed in the following manner.

- Determining whether or not the budget falls within the parameters of the LEA's first-year SIG grant, which may be no less than \$50,000 and no more than \$2 million.
- Examining the reasonableness and necessity of the budgeted amounts and whether or not the proposed activities align with the implementation requirements of the intervention model that will be used in the 2011-12 school year.
- Evaluating whether or not the LEA has been thoughtful and deliberate in planning for such things as:
 - The budgeted amount covers not only the pre-implementation activities but also the first-year activities required as part of the intervention model.
 - The budgeted amount directly relates to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, addresses the needs identified by the LEA, and advances the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in its identified schools.

(2)

A team of reviewers at the Idaho SDE, located within the Division of Student Achievement & School Improvement, will evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable by ensuring there is alignment between the activity carried out and the intent and requirements of the selected intervention model. This review will occur as part of the regular application approval process using the scoring guide (Attachment 5) that will be used with LEA applications. Pre-implementation activities will thus be evaluated with considerations such as the following:

(A) Are the proposed LEA activities to engage families and the community in preparation for the intervention model allowable? For example, are the funds being used for such things as:

- Conduct community meetings, gather input, inform parents/families, and gauge the needs of the community and its students?
- Communicate with families and local stakeholders about the school's status and need for improvement, options for choice, and other services available to support the needs of their students?
- Assist families in the decisions surrounding the transition to a new school in the event of a school closure?

(B) Are the proposed LEA activities to conduct a rigorous review of external providers allowable? For example, are the funds being used for such things as:

- Developing an appropriate RFP to find a successful CMO or EMO available in their area of the state?
- Recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers who can assist in the necessary preparations for implementing the intervention model?

(C) Are the proposed LEA activities related to staffing allowable? For example, are the funds being used for such things as:

- Recruit and hire a new principal and/or a new school leadership team
- **Recruit and hire** a new district-level turnaround specialist
- Establish a Lead Partner (**i.e., a liaison employed in the district office who is responsible and accountable for the success of each Tier I or II school's implementation and improvement**). **This may be a newly hired turnaround specialist or someone else that already exists within the organization who will take primary responsibility for the school being served.**
- Evaluate existing staff and determine what changes may be needed

(D) Are the LEA proposed activities for providing instructional support programs to the students in the school allowable? For example, are the funds being used for such things as:

- Remediating the academic needs of current students using evidence based programs and material?
- Identifying and selecting curricular materials, programs, and professional development that are evidence based and which are needed to improve the instructional core of the school's program?
- Compensating staff for collaboration, planning, and data analysis that will result in improved outcomes in the current year and when the intervention model is implemented in 2011-12?

(E) Are the LEA proposed activities for professional development and support allowable? For example, are the funds being used for such things as:

- Training staff at all levels on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs, policies, or processes?
- Preparing for and implementing a job-embedded coaching model?
- Structuring collaborative times, processes, and procedures that connect data-driven decision-making to instructional planning and delivery?
- Designing and implementing a common instructional framework and/or evaluation model?

Examples of Pre-Implementation Activities

The following are examples of permissible SIG-related activities that may be carried out in the 2010–2011 school year in preparation for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year. Reviewers will use these as examples for evaluation purposes when reviewing proposals. As such, they are possible activities that an LEA may carry out using SIG funds in the spring or summer prior to full implementation and should not be seen as exhaustive or as required. Rather, they illustrate possible activities, depending on the needs of particular SIG schools:

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- **Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity; or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.
- **Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with

evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- **Piloting an evaluation system for teachers and principals at schools receiving SIG funds to implement a transformation model:** An LEA may use SIG funds to pilot the rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that are required in schools implementing the transformation model. To meet the requirements of the transformation model, the pilot evaluation system must take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance, on-going collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement, and high school graduation rates. The pilot evaluation system must also be designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. Although an LEA might want to establish and implement a teacher and principal evaluation system that includes all teachers and principals within the LEA, SIG funds may not be used for district-wide activities. However, prior to launching a district-wide teacher and principal evaluation system, an LEA may use SIG funds to pilot the system for teachers and principals only at schools that are being served with SIG funds to ensure that the system is a useful tool that operates as intended. Similarly, an LEA may use SIG funds to support the salaries of evaluators who, as part of the LEA's preparation to fully implement an intervention model, observe and evaluate teachers in schools that are receiving SIG funds to begin implementing an intervention model at the beginning of the 2011–FY 2010
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools. In general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities.

In sum, the Idaho SDE will evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period by holding them up against the intent and requirements of the selected intervention model as indicated within the Final Requirements and as further explained and clarified in the FY 2010 SIG Guidance. Pre-implementation activities will be deemed allowable to the degree that they specifically support the required components of the model and to the degree which they are supplemental and do not supplant non-Federal funds.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

☐ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

The SDE will use the following criteria to evaluate whether a district lacks the capacity to implement a school reform model in each Tier I and Tier II School.

When determining the capacity to use SIG funds as prescribed in the final guidelines (Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Act, U.S. Department of Education, January 2010):

- **The State requires** the establishment of a district level Leadership Team that provides oversight and technical assistance to each Tier I and Tier II school. Participants should include federal programs, special education, curriculum director, superintendent, local trustee, parent, and others as appropriate. The district Leadership Team shall create a district improvement plan in the State's online planning tool (the WISE Tool district level indicators), and its capacity to lead the reform effort will be judged based upon the quality of that plan.
- Identification of a district level liaison (i.e., an internal lead partner **who is a central office employee**) for each Tier I and Tier II school who is accountable for the school's outcome. **For example, this may be a district turnaround specialist.**
- Number of Tier I and Tier II schools in the district and whether or not they reflect a feeder pattern.
- Partnership with external technical assistance providers (Capacity Builder, Institute of Higher Education, Educational Management Organization, etc.).
- Teacher talent (highly qualified, advanced degrees, nationally board certified, demonstrated success in accelerating student learning).
- District's ability to recruit a sufficient number of new educators.

- Infrastructures and system-wide supports (coordinated and aligned standards-based curriculum and assessments, response to intervention framework) to fully implement one of the four reform models.
- District's assessment that it can have the greatest impact on student achievement by focusing resources heavily on Tier I, II schools.
- District's assessment of the ability to serve both the needs of Tier I and II schools as well as any Tier III schools it is applying to serve.
- For the closure model, access and proximity to higher-performing schools.
- **Districts must first intend to meet the needs of and serve Tier I schools by implementing an intervention model before they serve Tier III schools.**

If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the State will evaluate the sufficiency of the claim based on the criteria above. If it is found that the LEA has more capacity than it claims, the State will arrange a meeting with the LEA to discuss capacity issues and require the LEA to adjust its application as appropriate.

D (PART 1). TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

Insert response to Section D (Part 1) Timeline here:

(1) Process and Timeline

A. **Process** – The LEA share of SIG funds (i.e. 95% of the state’s allocation from the USED) will be allocated as prescribed in federal guidelines, and priority will be given to districts based on the final requirements:

- SDE will give first priority to districts that apply on behalf of and have the capacity to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
- If SIG grants have been awarded to each district that requested funds that serve a Tier I or Tier II school, then the SDE may award remaining SIG funds to LEAs that seek to serve Tier III schools.
- A district with Tier I or Tier II schools will not be awarded SIG funds to serve only Tier III schools. It must first serve all of its Tier I schools prior to serving any Tier III schools.

B. **Timeline** - Districts will be notified of eligibility within one week of the State’s SIG application being approved by the US Department of Education (USED). With the notice of eligibility, a copy of the LEA application will be provided (i.e., the Directions for LEAs, the Application for LEAs, and the Scoring Rubric).

Within one week of receiving approval by the USED, the Idaho SDE will:

- Select a date for the submission of District Applications (to be within approximately 60-90 days of receiving approval from USED).
- Select a date for and schedule a two hour webinar and invite all eligible districts with Tiers I and II schools to participate, with the purpose of explaining the intervention models and application process (to be within approximately 30-40 days of receiving approval from USED). The webinar will go over:
 - i. The State’s Application for 1003(g) funds
 - ii. Brief description of the PLA identification process
 - iii. Brief description of the required intervention model choices
 - iv. District Application due date

- v. Directions to LEAs for the District Application
- vi. The application process for LEAs
- vii. The Scoring Rubric used by reviewers
- viii. The method for receiving technical assistance for the application process.
- ix. Post-approval processes and expectations
 - Select and schedule training for both reviewers and technical assistance providers.
 - Establish dates for proposal reviews (to be within approximately 90-100 days of receiving approval from USED).
 - Establish date for award announcements (to be within approximately 100-115 days of receiving approval from USED).
 - Allocated funds will be available to successful applicants immediately after award announcements.
 - Approved applications will be posted to SDE's web site within 48 hours of award announcements.
 - Districts will begin any planned pre-implementation processes upon approval and through August 2011.
 - Districts and Tier I and II schools will begin implementation of selected intervention models as of the beginning of the 2011-12 school year.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.³

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

☐ SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

NOTE TO REVIEWER: The descriptive information is approximately 95% the same as for FY 2009. Minor wording has been added for clarification in 2-6. Numbers 7-8 have been added for clarification.

(2) The SDE will monitor each district that receives a SIG to ensure that it is implementing a reform model fully and effectively in the Tier I and II schools that it has been approved to serve. The process will include:

- Oversight by the Idaho SDE Director of the Statewide System of Support (within the Student Achievement & School Improvement Division of the SDE).
- The Director will:
 - Oversee the scheduling of Focus Visits in each of the LEAs and schools.
 - Schedule review of implementation progress (both through the State online strategic planning tool (i.e., the WISE Tool, designed as “Indistar” by the federally funded Center on Innovation and Improvement) and onsite visits from regional School Improvement Coordinators.
 - Schedule phone and in-person interviews with key district and school leaders.
 - Review of quarterly cash balance reports for each funded LEA.

(3) The SDE’s process for reviewing the district’s annual goals for student achievement and if applicable annual goals for reducing dropout rate, for its Tier I and Tier II schools will include:

- Baseline CEE survey data (perceptual data about Educational Effectiveness).
- Summary of current classroom observation data (if not currently in place, then the district will report on its progress towards implementing regular walk-through observations in each of the Tier I and II schools).
- Tri-annual reports of student achievement data for each participating school (first, fifth, and ninth month of the academic year). The reports shall include (at a minimum):
 - The prior spring’s ISAT data.
 - Idaho Reading Indicators results (if applicable).
 - Primary Math Assessment results (if applicable).
 - Results of local interim or formative assessments (if not currently in place then the district will report on its progress towards implementing interim and formative assessments).

The SDE’s process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools that have been approved by the SDE will include:

- Baseline student achievement data for each participating school from the state’s ESEA accountability test from the year prior to SIG participation used as a comparison against changes at the end of each successive school year during

which the Tier III school is funded through SIG

- The degree to which the school met or exceeded the goals approved in the application, as based on the State's ESEA accountability test
- The degree to which improvement has occurred in other related non-assessment data, such as organizational trust/perceptions, tardies, absences, behavioral referrals, etc.

The SDE will determine whether to renew an LEA's SIG grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools that are not meeting those goals based upon trend data.

- Are the schools demonstrating a positive trend/trajectory toward meeting the goals on the accountability test, and to what degree have they missed the pre-defined goal?
- Are the schools demonstrating a positive trend/trajectory toward meeting other, non-assessment data?
- Do trends in the non-assessment data, such as organizational trust or behavior, indicate that foundational work is being accomplished that will be likely to result in better ESEA accountability test data the following year, if the school continues to receive SIG funding?

(4) In determining whether or not to renew a District's award, the SDE will consider:

- The difference between annual goals (stated in application) and the outcomes.
- The difference between the individual school results and state results in reading, math, and science for the "all students" category and for each sub-group.
- The difference between the individual school and other schools funded with SIG funds.
- Actions the district has taken to accelerate improvement in identified schools.
- Actions the district has taken to build capacity both within the school and the district.
- Evidence of the district's fidelity to the selected intervention model.
- Evidence of progress on the district's leading indicators as required in the SIG final requirements.
- The SDE will provide each district with a written summary of its findings.

(5) In the event that the SDE does not have sufficient funds to serve all eligible schools for which each district applies, allocations will be prioritized as follows:

- Districts that apply to serve either Tier I or Tier II schools.
- Districts that apply to serve only Tier III schools (except if the district has a Tier I or II school) and is an LEA identified as being among the highest need (combination of student achievement, demographics, years in improvement, graduation rate, and available local resources).
- Awards will only be made to LEAs applying to serve Tier III schools after awards have been made to fully serve, throughout the period of availability of funds all Tier I and Tier II schools in the state which districts have both committed to serve and which have the capacity to fully implement the requirements of the selected intervention model.

(6) The SDE may use one or both of the following factors in prioritizing among Tier III schools:

- Established need of the LEA applying to serve Tier III schools (among the highest need).
- Demonstrated evidence of commitment to improve student achievement (may include participation in such things as: the Idaho Building Capacity Project, Superintendents Network of Support, the Principals Academy of Leadership, etc.).

(7) At this time, the Idaho SDE has not elected to take over any Tier I or II schools in the state and thus cannot identify such schools. If at some point in the future the State elects to take over a Tier I or II school, the State will amend this section of its application with the USED, identify such schools, indicate the intervention model to be used, and post the amended State SIG application on its website within 48 hours of approval from USED.

(8) At this time, the Idaho SDE has not elected to provide services directly to any Tier I or II schools in the state in the absence of a takeover and thus cannot identify such schools. If at some point in the future the State elects to provide services directly to any Tier I or II schools in the state in the absence of a takeover, the State will amend this section of its application with the USED, identify such schools, indicate the intervention model to be used, provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the Idaho SDE provide such services directly, and post the amended State SIG application on its website within 48 hours of approval from USED.

As appropriate, the State will provide services directly to schools for which LEAs have applied for such services, and with the approval of the LEA, in the form of professional

development and technical assistance, but not the actual oversight of implementation of the intervention model (i.e., the State will not govern the school in any manner). Districts that agree to such services will allow the State to holdback sufficient funds for required or requested and agreed-upon State-level technical assistance and other supportive services (technical assistance providers, administration of CEE surveys, assessment of schools' implementation of the selected reform model, state-wide professional development for schools in Tiers I , II, and III, etc.). Requested activities may include, but are not limited to, assistance with the design and implementation of some of the required or permissible activities noted in the intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools, improvement activities in Tier III schools, or associated district-level activities that support improvement within eligible schools. Districts may also request that the SDE contract with external providers or other services which may be purchased through the SDE. All services provided directly to the LEA must be allowable under the final requirements and guidance of the SIG Fund.

E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- ☒ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ☒ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ☒ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- ☒ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ☒ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- ☒ Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- ☒ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

Idaho intends to reserve five percent of its 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds for administration and technical assistance. Idaho expects the five percent reservation to amount to approximately \$95,000. The Idaho Department of Education will utilize these funds to pay for administrative costs associated with personnel. Specifically, portions of employee salaries within the division of Student Achievement & School Improvement will be funded through the SEA reservation in relation to time spent on School Improvement activities and technical assistance related to the grant. Additionally, the state intends to coordinate and oversee the technical assistance that is paid for by LEAs in the activities outlined in the LEA Application, such as the Idaho Building Capacity project. Therefore, the SEA reservation amount will contribute to costs associated with travel, meetings, and other technical assistance. Lastly, the state intends to supplement these activities and expenses through the use of the State's 1003(g) administrative set-aside in order that school improvement efforts will be provided seamlessly between funding streams.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

☒ The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

☐ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Idaho requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** .

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 3: New list waiver

☒ Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

☒ The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Idaho requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

☒ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

☒ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

Enter State Name Here Idaho requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

☒ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

☒ The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful

implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (e.g., a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

LEA Budgets

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An

SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

APPENDIX B

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” [‡]	Title I eligible [§] elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. ^{**}	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two years.

[‡] “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

[§] For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

^{**} Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.

Idaho SIG 1003(g) FY 2010 Application

Attachments to Support State Application Packet

Attachment 1: Methodology for Defining Tiers I, II, and III.....2

Attachment 2: Tables of Schools Eligible for SIG.....19

Attachment 3: LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants.....32

Attachment 4: LEA Application for School Improvement Grants53

Attachment 5: Scoring Guide for LEA Application.....71

Attachment 6: Evidence of Public Notice and Comment Period.....99

Attachment 1: Methodology for Defining Tiers I, II, and III

Methodology – Determining Tiers I, II, and III for School Improvement Grants

References:

- **SIG-A** - *School Improvement Grants Application: Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (January, 2010)
- **SIG-G** - *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010)

This document is organized according to the steps outlined in *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) as set forth in Section A-18, the required sequence of steps for developing the final list of persistently lowest-achieving schools in Tiers I and II.

Step 1: Relevant Definitions

A) Secondary School

Idaho code defines a “secondary school” as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof. However, Idaho also has combinations of schools that may extend lower than grade seven (7), but which still contain secondary grades. Therefore the classification “elementary/secondary school” defines schools that serve grades one (1) through twelve (12) inclusive, or any combination thereof. (IDAPA 33-1001)

B) Number of Years – Graduation Rate

Three consecutive years of graduation rates are calculated based upon data from 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 respectively. Final graduation data for 2008-09 were not available yet for use in calculations for the SIG fund.

C) Number of Years – Lack of Progress

Lack of progress calculations are based on data and statewide Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements for 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 respectively. Idaho requires the same accountability structure for all schools regardless of Title I funding or eligibility. Therefore, AYP determinations are stable constructs for both Tier I and Tier II schools in the persistently lowest-achieving definition.

D) Achievement

Rank order to determine the lowest achievement was based upon the most recent 2008-09 ESEA accountability data in both Reading/Language Arts (the Idaho accountability assessment is specifically called “Reading”) and Mathematics. The “all students” category was utilized. Percent proficient or advanced was calculated based upon all students in the building who took the test, regardless of grade level, and then aggregated according to proficiency bands to determine the number proficient or

advanced out of the total number taking the test. For example, if there were ten students in grade 3, ten in grade 4, ten in grade 5, and ten in grade 6; and if four 3rd graders, six 4th graders, eight 5th graders, and ten 6th graders were proficient in each grade respectively; the calculation would be as follows: $(4+6+8+10) / (10+10+10+10) = (28 / 40) = 0.7$. In this example, **70%** of the students in the school were proficient.

E) Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Final requirements under section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) specify that School Improvement Grants (SIGs) will be available to a state's Title I schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, with priority of funding to be reserved for the persistently lowest-achieving schools described by two of three tiers. According to SIG requirements, each state must determine the persistently lowest-achieving schools according to the following definitions:

Persistently lowest-achieving schools means, as determined by the State —

(a)

(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(b) To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both--

(i) The academic achievement of the "all students" group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(ii) The school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group.

The Idaho Department of Education (IDE), therefore, used the SIG guidance document to specify how “lowest achievement” and “lack of progress” were to be identified in order to meet the above requirements. Therefore, IDE more specifically defines its three tiers of eligible schools by taking into account achievement and progress according to the following definitions and criteria for Tier I (a1), Tier II (a2), and Tier III (Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I).

Tier I Schools:

There are two types of Tier I schools: those Title I funded schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving schools, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students” category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Persistent lack of progress is defined as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**

- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state's proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I funded high school (a "secondary school" is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.¹

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier I.

Tier II Schools:

There are two types of Tier II schools: those Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years. Secondary schools are defined in Idaho Code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible but not Title I funded, the Idaho Department of Education used the "all students" category based on those students who take the state's assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The "all students" category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the "all students" category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants*

¹ Currently no high school in Idaho has had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years.

Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Since Idaho has one accountability system, even Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are classified according to adequately yearly progress standards. Therefore, persistent lack of progress is defined by all of the following criteria:

- Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category for EITHER reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009, AND

- Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category at least one or more times in EITHER reading or mathematics for school years 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 respectively, AND
- Having (a) fewer students scoring proficient or advanced (i.e., a decreasing proficiency trend) in (b) EITHER reading or mathematics or both in the “all students” category in school year 2008-2009 when compared to school year 2006-2007.

A Title I eligible, but not funded, school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in that category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier II.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I eligible, but not funded, high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier II.

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier II.

Tier III Schools:

All Title I funded schools that are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, but which are not Tier I schools are classified in Tier III. LEAs may apply for 1003(g) SIG funds for Tier III schools according to the requirements and regulations outlined in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010).

Newly Eligible Schools:

ISDE did not choose to include the option of “newly eligible schools” that was authorized under the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010. Therefore, any such Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are not included in the data or analysis for the SIG fund.

Step 2: Determine Number That Makes Up Each Tier

A) There are 652 schools in the State of Idaho for which Adequate Yearly Progress is calculated.	
Tier I	Tier II
B) Of those 652 schools, there are 376 Title I funded schools <i>276 schools removed for not being Title I funded</i>	B) Of those 652 schools, there are 308 schools that elementary/secondary schools or secondary schools. <i>343 schools removed for being solely elementary schools</i>
C) Of the 376 Title I funded schools, 160 schools are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. <i>216 schools removed for not being in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring</i>	C) Of the 308 schools, 100 schools are eligible for Title I funds, but are not served by Title I funds. <i>208 schools removed for either not being eligible or for being Title I funded and therefore part of the Tier I equation.</i>
D) Given a set of 160 schools, 5% is equal to <u>8</u> schools.	D) Given a set of 100 schools, 5% is equal to <u>5</u> schools.
Graduation Rates: High schools with a graduation rate of less than 60% over three consecutive years would be added to Tier I (if Title I funded) or Tier II (if Title I eligible, but not funded). No high school in Idaho has a graduation rate that meets this criteria. Therefore, no high schools were added to Tiers I or II.	
Tier III	
E) Given a set of 160 schools that are Title I funded and in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, any such school that is not in Tier I is in Tier III. Therefore, 160 possible Title I funded schools less 8 schools in Tier I equals <u>152</u> schools ($160 - 8 = 152$).	
Total Schools in Tier I	<u>8</u>
Total Schools in Tier II	<u>5</u>
Total Schools in Tier III	<u>152</u>

Additional note: No schools approved for SIG funds in FY2009 implemented school intervention models that were eligible for the waiver to start over in the school improvement timeline; all utilized the Transformation Model. Therefore, the FY2010 list accounts for all of the schools that were identified in the 2009 list.

Step 3: Determine Method for Combined Proficiency Rates

For the purpose of the SIG Fund Idaho determines combined proficiency rates by using the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School*

Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

The two ranks added together serve as the combined, or composite, value that represents the percent of proficient students in each school relative to all other schools in the state. The chart below demonstrates how these ranks are added.

School Name	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Math 2008-09	State Rank for Math Proficiency	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Reading 2008-09	State Rank for Reading Proficiency	Composite Ranks (i.e., Added Ranks)
School A	16	1	30	1	2
School B	29	3	33	2	5
School C	33	4	53	3	7
School D	25	2	63	6	8
School E	42	5	57	4	9

Step 4: Determine Method for Lack of Progress

Lack of Progress – Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Persistent lack of progress is defined as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Because the Lack of Progress definition is dichotomous, a school either makes progress, or it does not make progress. Thus, any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

Step 5: Determine Weights for Achievement

No weights are assigned to academic achievement. As described in Step 3, both reading/language arts and mathematics are counted equally. All schools are ranked in each content area relative to all other schools in the state. Then, the two content area ranks are “added” to determine a composite, or combined, ranking.

Step 6: Determine Weights for Type of School

No weights are assigned to the type of school. Idaho has numerous combinations of schools: elementary schools, secondary schools, elementary/secondary schools, separate secondary schools, and so forth (IDAPA 33-1001). There is no statistically valid reason to weight one category of school over the other.

Step 7: Rank Lowest to Highest Achievement for Tier I

Using the “combined ranks” method described in Step 3, all Title I funded schools are ranked in order from lowest rank to highest rank. The “added ranks” for each of the schools serves as a composite rank. The school with the lowest composite rank (*e.g.*, 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts

and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 8: Apply Lack of Progress to the Ranked Tier I List

As described in the SIG guidance document, the Lack of Specific Progress method is dichotomous. Specifically, it says: “Under this example, there are only two options: a school makes progress, as defined by the SEA, or the school does not” (SIG-G, p.7). Therefore, the identification of schools that are low achieving and persistently so is a two layer process. The composite rank earned in Step 7 is based upon 2009 data. Then, each school is defined as either making sufficient progress or not. Persistent lack of progress for Tier I is defined as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

The following chart demonstrates an example of how the combinations of Adequate Yearly Progress in each of the “all students” categories were used to define the specific progress made over the course of three years.

School Name	Composite Rank (i.e., Added Ranks)	Did the school make AYP in 2006-2008? (Y/N)				Combinations Missed AYP Out of 4 Possible(2006-2008)	Did the school make AYP in 2009? (Y/N)		Combination Missed AYP (2009)	Lack of Progress Criteria (i.e., 2009 + previous years combination)	Did school lack specific progress? (Yes / No)
		Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2007-08	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2007-08		Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2008-09	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2008-09			
Example School A	2	N	N	N	N	4	N	N	Both	BOTH + 4	YES
Example School B	7	N	N	N	N	4	Y	Y	n/a	Neither + 4	NO
Example School C	19	Y	N	N	N	3	N	N	Both	BOTH + 3	YES
Example School D	18	Y	N	N	N	3	N	Y	One	EITHER + 3	YES
Example School E	27	N	N	N	N	4	N	Y	One	EITHER + 4	YES
Example School F	28	Y	N	N	Y	2	Y	Y	n/a	Neither + 2	NO
Example School G	39	Y	N	Y	N	2	N	N	Both	BOTH + 2	YES
Example School H	38	Y	Y	N	N	2	N	Y	One	EITHER + 2	NO
Example School I	42	N	N	N	N	4	N	Y	One	Either + 4	YES
Example School J	41	N	N	N	Y	3	Y	Y	n/a	Neither + 3	NO

Step 9: Count Up the Relevant Number for Tier I

The relevant list of Tier I schools is then determined by counting up from the lowest ranked schools that also are marked “Yes” for Lack of Specific Progress until the number set forth in Step 2 above is reached. In this case, 8 schools are identified for Tier I.

Case-by-Case Scenarios. In counting up the number of Tier I schools, there were two schools that were initially identified for inclusion in Tier I. IDE analyzed the data for these schools using the “case-by-case” scenario presented in section A-17 of the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section*

1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (January 20, 2010). Section A-17 states an SEA may not exclude categories of schools in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, except in one narrow circumstance. It goes on to say: “One narrow exception to the general rule above may be a category consisting of schools specifically designed to serve over-age, under-credited students—i.e., schools designed to re-engage students who have dropped out of high school and who, by definition, cannot graduate within the standard number of years” (p.8). In the case of these schools, it was deemed that the schools were alternative high schools that fall under this exception to the rule. By virtue of the fact that they serve populations that are continuously in flux due to drop outs who are being re-engaged, it was determined that the schools would be more appropriately served in Tier III.

Step 10: Identify Relevant Title I High Schools Based on Graduation Rate for Tier I

No Idaho Title I secondary schools had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years. Therefore, no high schools were identified.

Step 11: Add Relevant Title I High Schools to Tier I Based on Graduation Rate

Because no secondary schools were identified in Step 10, none were added to Tier I in this step.

Step 12: Rank Lowest to Highest Achievement for Tier II

Using the “combined ranks” method described in Step 3, all Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools are ranked in order from lowest rank to highest rank. The “added ranks” for each of the schools serves as a composite rank. The school with the lowest composite rank (*e.g.*, 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest composite rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 13: Apply Lack of Progress to the Ranked Tier II List

As described in the SIG guidance document, the Lack of Specific Progress method is dichotomous. Specifically, it says: “Under this example, there are only two options: a school makes progress, as defined by the SEA, or the school does not” (SIG-G, p.7). Therefore, the identification of schools that are low achieving and persistently so is a two layer process. The composite rank earned in Step 12 is based upon 2009 data. Then, each school is defined as either making sufficient progress or not. Since Idaho has one accountability system, even Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are classified according to adequately yearly progress standards. Because secondary schools’ AYP is usually analyzed on the basis

on just one grade level (e.g., 10th), persistent lack of specific progress is defined more robustly by all of the following criteria being true:

- Criteria 1 – Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category for EITHER reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009, AND
- Criteria 2 – Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category at least one or more times in EITHER reading or mathematics for school years 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 respectively, AND
- Criteria 3 – Having (a) fewer students scoring proficient or advanced (i.e., a decreasing proficiency trend) in (b) EITHER reading or mathematics or both in the “all students” category in school year 2008-2009 when compared to school year 2006-2007.

A Title I eligible, but not funded, school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier II.

The following chart demonstrates an example of how the combinations of Adequate Yearly Progress in each of the “all students” categories were used to define the specific progress made over the course of three years.

School	Composite Rank (i.e., Added Ranks)	Change in Math			Change in Reading			AYP All Students 2006 to 2008					AYP All Students 2009			Lack of Progress Criteria			Did School Lack Specific Progress? (Yes / No)
		Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Math 2006-07	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Math 2008-09	Difference: Math 2007 to 2009	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Reading 2006-07	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Reading 2008-09	Difference: Reading 2007 to 2009	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2007-08	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2007-08	Missed AYP Count - 2006 to 2008	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2008-09	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2008-09	Missed AYP Count - 2009	Criteria 1 (T/F)	Criteria 2 (T/F)	Criteria 3 (T/F)	
Example 1	3	24	39	15	43	63	20	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	F	F	T	No
Example 2	8	29	41	12	40	75	35	Y	N	Y	Y	1	Y	Y	0	F	T	T	No
Example 3	10	57	52	-5	74	70	-4	N	N	N	N	4	N	N	2	T	T	T	YES
Example 4	21	70	65	-5	62	76	14	Y	N	Y	Y	1	Y	Y	0	F	T	T	No
Example 5	24	85	54	-31	85	83	-2	N	N	Y	Y	2	N	Y	1	T	T	T	YES
Example 6	25	64	63	-1	82	82	0	N	Y	N	Y	2	N	Y	1	T	T	T	YES
Example 7	27	55	45	-10	73	84	11	Y	Y	N	Y	1	N	Y	1	T	T	T	YES
Example 8	42	64	69	5	80	83	3	N	Y	Y	N	2	Y	Y	0	F	T	T	No

Step 14: Count Up the Relevant Number for Tier II

The relevant list of Tier II schools is then determined by counting up from the lowest ranked schools that also are marked “Yes” for Lack of Specific Progress until the number set forth in Step 2 above is reached. In this case, 5 schools are identified for Tier II.

Step 15: Identify Relevant Title I Eligible High Schools Based on Graduation Rate for Tier II

No Idaho Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary school had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years. Therefore, no secondary schools were identified.

Step 16: Add Relevant Title I Eligible High Schools to Tier II Based on Graduation Rate

Because no secondary schools were identified in Step 15, none were added to Tier II in this step.

Attachment 2: Tables of Schools Eligible for SIG

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
ABERDEEN DISTRICT	1600030	ABERDEEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600030	00828			X	
ABERDEEN DISTRICT	1600030	ABERDEEN MIDDLE SCHOOL	1600030	00829	X			
AMERICAN FALLS JOINT DISTRICT	1600060	A F INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	1600060	00816			X	
AMERICAN FALLS JOINT DISTRICT	1600060	HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600060	00005			X	
AMERICAN FALLS JOINT DISTRICT	1600060	WILLIAM THOMAS MIDDLE SCHOOL	1600060	00589			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	BLACKFOOT COMMUNITY LEARNING	1600270	00796	X			
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	BLACKFOOT SIXTH GRADE SCHOOL	1600270	00030			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	DONALD D. STALKER ELEMENTARY	1600270	00031			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	I T STODDARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600270	00028			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	INDEPENDENCE ALTERNATE HIGH	1600270	00689			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	WAPELLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600270	00032			X	
BLAINE COUNTY DISTRICT	1600300	WOODSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600300	00908			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	HORIZON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600360	00009			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600360	00059			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	KOELSCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600360	00060			X	
BOISE	1600360	LOWELL	1600360	00063			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
INDEPENDENT DISTRICT		ELEMENTARY SCHOOL						
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	WHITNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600360	00078			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	WHITTIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600360	00079			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	CLOVERDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600930	00630			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	FAIRVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600930	00172			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	ROCKY MOUNTAIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	1600930	00168			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	TELFORD ACADEMY (ALT)	1600930	00649			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	UCON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600930	00178			X	
BOUNDARY COUNTY DISTRICT	1600420	NAPLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600420	00092			X	
BRUNEAU-GRAND VIEW JOINT DIST	1600450	BRUNEAU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600450	00098			X	
BRUNEAU-GRAND VIEW JOINT DIST	1600450	GRAND VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600450	00099			X	
BRUNEAU-GRAND VIEW JOINT DIST	1600450	RIMROCK JR-SR HIGH SCHOOL	1600450	00100			X	
BUHL JOINT DISTRICT	1600480	Buhl Middle School	1600480	00103			X	
BUHL JOINT DISTRICT	1600480	POPPLEWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600480	00101			X	
BUTTE COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600490	ARCO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600490	00007			X	
BUTTE COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600490	BUTTE COUNTY MIDDLE SCHOOL	1600490	00662			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	LEWIS AND CLARK ELEMENTARY	1600510	00835			X	
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600510	00106			X	
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	Syringa Middle School	1600510	00109			X	
CAMBRIDGE JOINT DISTRICT	1600570	CAMBRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600570	00112			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	BURLEY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	1600660	00125			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	CASSIA EDUCATION CENTER (ALT)	1600660	00540			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	DECLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600660	00126			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	DECLO JR HIGH SCHOOL	1600660	00610			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	DWORSHAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600660	00128			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY	1600660	00130			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	WHITE PINE ELEMENTARY	1600660	00387			X	
COEUR D'ALENE DISTRICT	1600780	PROJ CDA HIGH SCHOOL	1600780	00694			X	
COEUR D'ALENE DISTRICT	1600780	SKYWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600780	00799			X	
CULDESAC JOINT DISTRICT	1600870	CULDESAC SCHOOL	1600870	00164			X	
EMMETT INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1601020	KENNETH CARBERRY INTERMEDIATE	1601020	00797			X	
FIRTH DISTRICT	1601080	A W JOHNSON ELEMENTARY	1601080	00196			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
		SCHOOL						
FIRTH DISTRICT	1601080	FIRTH MIDDLE SCHOOL	1601080	00326			X	
FREMONT COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601110	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601110	00622			X	
FREMONT COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601110	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601110	00202			X	
FREMONT COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601110	SOUTH FREMONT JR HIGH	1601110	00625			X	
GARDEN CITY COMMUNITY CHARTER DIST	1600013	GARDEN CITY COMMUNITY CHARTER	1600013	00890			X	
GLENNS FERRY JOINT DISTRICT	1601230	GLENNS FERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601230	00219			X	
GLENNS FERRY JOINT DISTRICT	1601230	GLENNS FERRY HIGH SCHOOL	1601230	00220			X	
GLENNS FERRY JOINT DISTRICT	1601230	GLENNS FERRY MIDDLE SCHOOL	1601230	00744			X	
GOODING JOINT DISTRICT	1601260	GOODING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601260	00223			X	
GOODING JOINT DISTRICT	1601260	GOODING MIDDLE SCHOOL	1601260	00222			X	
HOMEDALE JOINT DISTRICT	1601470	HOMEDALE HIGH SCHOOL	1601470	00248			X	
HORSESHOE BEND SCHOOL DISTRICT	1601500	HORSESHOE BEND ELEMENTARY	1601500	00506			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	A H BUSH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601530	00252			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	CLAIR E. GALE JR HIGH SCHOOL	1601530	00255			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	DORA ERICKSON ELEM SCHOOL	1601530	00256			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	EAGLE ROCK JUNIOR HIGH	1601530	00257			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
		SCHOOL						
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	ETHEL BOYES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601530	00260			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	FOXHOLLOW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601530	00726			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	LINDEN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601530	00263			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	THERESA BUNKER ELEMENTARY	1601530	00270			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601530	00633			X	
IDAHO VIRTUAL ACADEMY DISTRICT	1600004	IDAHO VIRTUAL ACADEMY	1600004	00859			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	HARWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601570	00634			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601570	00276			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	MIDWAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	1601570	00275			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	ROBERTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601570	00278			X	
JEROME JOINT DISTRICT	1601590	HORIZON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601590	00272			X	
JEROME JOINT DISTRICT	1601590	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601590	00283			X	
JEROME JOINT DISTRICT	1601590	JEROME MIDDLE SCHOOL	1601590	00285			X	
KAMIAH JOINT DISTRICT	1601620	KAMIAH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601620	00286			X	
KELLOGG JOINT DISTRICT	1601650	PINEHURST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601650	00294			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
KELLOGG JOINT DISTRICT	1601650	SUNNYSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601650	00297			X	
KENDRICK JOINT DISTRICT	1601680	JULIAETTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601680	00298			X	
KIMBERLY DISTRICT	1601710	KIMBERLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601710	00300			X	
KUNA JOINT DISTRICT	1601770	HUBBARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601770	00596			X	
KUNA JOINT DISTRICT	1601770	ROSS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601770	00915			X	
LAKE PEND OREILLE DISTRICT	1600002	FARMIN STIDWELL ELEMENTARY SCH	1600002	00615			X	
LAKE PEND OREILLE DISTRICT	1600002	LAKE PEND OREILLE ALT HIGH SCH	1600002	00691			X	
LAPWAI DISTRICT	1601830	LAPWAI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601830	00317			X	
MADISON DISTRICT	1601920	KENNEDY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601920	00338			X	
MADISON DISTRICT	1601920	MADISON MIDDLE SCHOOL	1601920	00210			X	
MARSING JOINT DISTRICT	1601980	MARSING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1601980	00351			X	
MARSING JOINT DISTRICT	1601980	MARSING MIDDLE SCHOOL	1601980	00636			X	
MCCALL-DONNELLY DISTRICT	1602030	MCCALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602030	00356			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	DESERT SAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602100	00901			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	LINDER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602100	00639			X	
MERIDIAN	1602100	MC MILLAN	1602100	00363			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
JOINT DISTRICT		ELEMENTARY SCHOOL						
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	PEREGRINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602100	00794			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	SUMMERWIND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602100	00364			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	USTICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602100	00374			X	
MINIDOKA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1602190	HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602190	00382			X	
MINIDOKA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1602190	PAUL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602190	00641			X	
MINIDOKA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1602190	RUPERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602190	00666			X	
MOUNTAIN HOME DISTRICT	1602250	HACKER MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602250	00745		X		
MOUNTAIN HOME DISTRICT	1602250	WEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602250	00403	X			
MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600139	CLEARWATER VALLEY JR/SR HIGH SCHL	1600139	00936			X	
MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600139	GRANGEVILLE ELEM MIDDLE SCHOOL	1600139	00946			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	CENTENNIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602340	00409			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	EAST VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602340	00811			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	ENDEAVOR ELEMENTARY	1602340	00947			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	IOWA ELEMENTARY	1602340	00375			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL	1602340	SHERMAN ELEMENTARY	1602340	00379			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
DISTRICT								
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	SNAKE RIVER ELEMENTARY	1602340	00507			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602340	00422			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	WILLOW CREEK ELEMENTARY	1602340	00833			X	
PARMA DISTRICT	1602550	MAXINE JOHNSON ELEMENTARY	1602550	00449			X	
PARMA DISTRICT	1602550	PARMA MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602550	00080			X	
PAYETTE JOINT DISTRICT	1602580	MC CAIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602580	00455			X	
PAYETTE JOINT DISTRICT	1602580	PAYETTE PRIMARY SCHOOL	1602580	00171			X	
PAYETTE JOINT DISTRICT	1602580	WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602580	00456			X	
PLUMMER-WORLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1600815	LAKESIDE HIGH SCHOOL	1600815	00720			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	CLAUDE A WILCOX ELEM SCHOOL	1602640	00465			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602640	00475			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	KINPORT ACADEMY	1602640	00686			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	LEWIS & CLARK ELEMENTARY SCH	1602640	00476			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	SYRINGA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602640	00481			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	TYHEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602640	00483			X	
POST FALLS DISTRICT	1602670	MULLAN TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602670	00800			X	
POST FALLS	1602670	POST FALLS	1602670	00489			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
DISTRICT		MIDDLE SCHOOL						
PRESTON JOINT DISTRICT	1600960	OAKWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600960	00181			X	
PRESTON JOINT DISTRICT	1600960	PRESTON JR HIGH SCHOOL	1600960	00612			X	
RICHFIELD DISTRICT	1602760	RICHFIELD SCHOOL	1602760	00497			X	
SHELLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1602910	DONALD J HOBBS MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602910	00723			X	
SHELLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1602910	HAZEL STUART ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602910	00511			X	
SHELLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1602910	SHELLEY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	1602910	00510			X	
SHOSHONE JOINT DISTRICT	1602940	SHOSHONE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602940	512	X			
SHOSHONE JOINT DISTRICT	1602940	SHOSHONE MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602940	850		X		
SNAKE RIVER DISTRICT	1602970	RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1602970	00518			X	
SODA SPRINGS JOINT DISTRICT	1603000	HOWARD E THIRKILL PRIMARY SCH	1603000	00525			X	
ST. MARIES JOINT DISTRICT	1603060	HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603060	00485			X	
ST. MARIES JOINT DISTRICT	1603060	UPRIVER ELEMENTARY-JR HIGH SCHOOL	1603060	00536			X	
SUGAR-SALEM JOINT DISTRICT	1603090	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603090	00537			X	
TETON COUNTY DISTRICT	1603180	DRIGGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603180	00754			X	
TETON COUNTY	1603180	TETON MIDDLE SCHOOL	1603180	00544			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
DISTRICT								
TROY SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600009	TROY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600009	00581			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	BICKEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603240	00548			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	HARRISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603240	00549			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	MAGIC VALLEY ALTERNATIVE HIGH	1603240	00703			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	OREGON TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603240	00316			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	ROBERT STUART JR HIGH SCHOOL	1603240	00553			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	VERA C O'LEARY JR HIGH SCHOOL	1603240	00552			X	
VALLEY DISTRICT	1603270	VALLEY SCHOOL	1603270	00558			X	
VALLIVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600600	BIRCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600600	00778			X	
VALLIVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600600	EAST CANYON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600600	00115			X	
VALLIVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600600	WEST CANYON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600600	00119			X	
WALLACE DISTRICT	1603300	SILVER HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603300	00562			X	
WENDELL DISTRICT	1603360	WENDELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603360	00570			X	
WENDELL DISTRICT	1603360	WENDELL MIDDLE SCHOOL	1603360	00571			X	
WEST BONNER COUNTY DISTRICT	1600001	PRIEST RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600001	00619			X	
WEST JEFFERSON DISTRICT	1603400	TERRETON ELEM-JR HIGH SCHOOL	1603400	00280			X	

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
WILDER DISTRICT	1603480	HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1603480	00585	X			
WILDER DISTRICT	1603480	WILDER MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	1603480	00530			X	

Additional note: No schools approved for SIG funds in FY2009 implemented school intervention models that were eligible for the waiver to start over in the school improvement timeline; all utilized the Transformation Model. Therefore, the FY2010 list accounts for all of the schools that were identified in the 2009 list.

SCHOOLS SERVED BY FY 2009 SIG FUNDS

District_Name	LEA NCES ID #	School_Name	School NCES ID		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	FORT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600270	00026	X			
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	1600510	105	X			
MELBA JOINT DISTRICT	1602070	MELBA MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602070	254		X		
MURTAUGH JOINT DISTRICT	1602310	MURTAUGH MIDDLE SCHOOL	1602310	407		X		
PLUMMER-WORLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1600815	LAKESIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1600815	719	X			
SNAKE RIVER DISTRICT	1602970	SNAKE RIVER JR HIGH SCHOOL	1602970	520		X		

Additional note: No schools approved for SIG funds in FY2009 implemented school intervention models that were eligible for the waiver to start over in the school improvement timeline; all utilized the Transformation Model. Therefore, the FY2010 list accounts for all of the schools that were identified in the 2009 list.

Attachment 3: LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Instructions to LEAs

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Please read the following information before completing the questions in the *School Improvement Grant (SIG)* application.

- To prepare districts for implementing school intervention models and improvement activities in the 2011-12 school year, a portion of SIG funds will be available immediately after awards announced.
- Depending on continued funding, grantees may be eligible to renew their SIG grants for up to two additional one-year periods (2012-13 and 2013-14).
- Directions:
 - In order to expedite funding of successful proposals the applications will be sent to reviewers electronically. Therefore district applications must be submitted electronically to Steve Underwood, sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov.
 - Districts should use this application as a template. In other words you may paste your responses into this Word document.

PURPOSE of GRANT

Idaho has always reserved 4% of our Title I allocation to support School Improvement. Resources available from the ESEA School Improvement Grant 1003(a) allow the Idaho SDE to greatly extend the amount of support offered to schools. The purpose of these funds is to turn around the lowest 5% of persistently low-achieving Title I schools and Title I-eligible secondary schools.

Based on federal guidelines, SIG funds will be used in Idaho to:

- Provide financial resources to qualifying districts to implement selected intervention model(s) in identified Tier I and Tier II schools with strict fidelity, per federal regulations (see definitions of Tier I Schools and Tier II Schools below in *Criteria for Awarding SIGs to Districts* and on the U.S. Department of Education's web site <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>).
- Provide financial resources to qualifying districts to support activities and services in identified Tier III schools, per federal regulations (a definition of Tier III Schools can be found below and on the U.S. Department of Education's web site <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>).
- Provide financial resources to support the use of approved technical assistance providers (Capacity Builders) to LEAs implementing one of the four reform models

(closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) or to LEAs with Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

- Provide financial resources to aid districts and schools in developing effective structures and conditions essential to continuous improvement and to sustain reforms after the funding period ends. Schools in qualifying districts may apply to be part of statewide efforts such as:
 - i. The Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project
 - ii. Instructional Core Focus Visits
 - iii. Network of Support for Trustees
 - iv. Network of Support for Superintendents
 - v. Network of Support for Central Office Staff
 - vi. Network of Support for Principals (Principals Academy of Leadership)

CRITERIA FOR AWARDING SIGs TO DISTRICTS

Based on federal guidelines, School Improvement Grants (SIGs) are available to districts which 1) demonstrate greatest need; and 2) provide evidence of strongest commitment to use SIG funds to raise student achievement substantially and graduation rates (if applicable). Districts also must demonstrate the capacity to both implement and sustain reforms over time. Definitions of Persistently Lowest-achieving Schools, Greatest Need, Required Interventions, and Strongest Commitment follow:

In federal guidelines greatest need is established by segmenting schools into three categories: Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III. Schools in Tier I and Tier II are considered the *Persistently Lowest Achieving*. The following is the methodology Idaho has used to determine the Tiers.

Tier I Schools:

There are two types of Tier I schools: those Title I funded schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving schools, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students”

category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Persistent lack of progress is defined as not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes adequate yearly progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I funded high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.²

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier I.

Tier II Schools:

There are two types of Tier II schools: those Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years. Secondary schools are defined in Idaho Code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible but not Title I funded, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts

² Currently no high school in Idaho has had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years.

and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students” category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rate would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Since Idaho has one accountability system, even Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are classified according to adequately yearly progress standards. Therefore, persistent lack of progress is defined by all of the following criteria:

- Not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category for EITHER reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009, AND
- Not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category at least one or more times in EITHER reading or mathematics for school years 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 respectively, AND
- Having (a) fewer students scoring proficient or advanced (i.e., a decreasing proficiency trend) in (b) EITHER reading or mathematics or both in the “all students” category in school year 2008-2009 when compared to school year 2006-2007.

A Title I eligible, but not funded, school makes adequate yearly progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier II.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I eligible, but not funded, high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier II.

Tier III Schools:

All Title I funded schools that are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, but which are not Tier I schools are classified in Tier III. LEAs may apply for 1003(g) SIG funds for Tier III schools according to the requirements and regulations outlined in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010).

REQUIRED INTERVENTIONS FOR TIER I AND II SCHOOLS

The final guidance of the 1003g application to states specifies that SIGs will be awarded to eligible districts committing to implement one of the following four federally-defined school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools.

- **Turnaround model**, which includes, among other actions, replacing the principal and rehiring up to 50% of the school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with the State's academic standards. A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model or a new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).
- **Restart model**, in which a district converts the school to a charter school or closes and reopens it under the management of an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- **School closure**, in which the district closes the school and enrolls the students who attended the school in other higher-achieving schools in the district.
- **Transformation model**, which addresses areas critical to transforming persistently low-achieving schools. These areas include: developing teacher and principal leader effectiveness (depending on the length of tenure this could mean replacing the current administrator), implementing comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extending learning time and creating community connections, and providing operating flexibility and sustained support.

Additional information on each of these reform models can be found in the Center on Innovation & Improvement's *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants, 2009*, www.cii.org. There are links to the *Handbook* on both the Idaho State Department of Education's web site, www.sde.idaho.gov and Boise State's Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies <http://csi.boisestate.edu/improvement/SIHome.html>. In addition to **Greatest Need**, federal guidelines require States to look at **Strongest Commitment** and Capacity of the district to serve identified schools. The State must consider, at a minimum, the extent to which the application shows the district's efforts and/or plans to:

- Analyze school needs and match interventions to those needs.
 - Analysis of school needs must include:
 - Disaggregated analysis of student achievement data and if applicable outcome data (graduation rates, percentage of students going on to post-secondary opportunities, dropout rate).
 - Use of the Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE) survey to gather perceptual data from students, teachers, parents.
 - Participation in Focus Visit.
- Design interventions consistent with the four intervention model(s) as described in Criteria for Awarding SIGs to Districts above.

- Use an approved technical assistance provider (Idaho Capacity Builder) or demonstrate evidence that the external provider selected by the LEA has a proven track record in turning around low achieving schools.
- Embed interventions in longer-term plans to sustain gains in achievement.
- Align other resources with the interventions.
- Modify practices, policies, and procedures, if necessary, to enable the school(s) to implement both the reform model and the specific interventions fully and effectively.
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

FUNDING

Details for SIG funds include the following:

- Anticipated Amount of Awards for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Schools: Districts may apply for funding ranging from \$50,000 annually to \$2,000,000 annually for each **Tier I**, **Tier II** and **Tier III** school the district applies to serve (see Sample Annual District Allocation Model). This higher limit, which was included by the Consolidated Appropriations Act on December 16, 2009 and published in the new School Improvement Grant Interim Final Requirements on January 15, 2010, permits the SDE to award directly the amount that may be necessary for successful implementation of one of the four intervention models described above in Tier I and Tier II schools. For example, a school of 250 students might need \$150,000 to fully and effectively implement a federally approved reform model, a school with 500 students might require \$250,000 and a large, comprehensive high school might require \$750,000 to implement the reform.
- Availability of Funds: SIG funds will be available in Spring 2011 to support award grantees in the pre-implementation period to create the necessary conditions for implementing school reform models and improvement activities/services in the 2011-12 school year.
- Priority: The SDE must give first priority to districts that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools. No funds may be awarded to any district for Tier III schools unless and until the SDE has awarded SIG funds to serve fully, throughout the period of availability of SIG funds, all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that districts commit to serve and the SDE determines districts have the capacity to serve. A district with one or more Tier I or Tier II schools may not receive funds to serve only Tier III schools unless and until it has an approved proposal to serve schools in Tier I and Tier II.
- District-level Activities: Districts may use SIG funds to conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) in the district's Tier I and Tier II schools and to support school improvement activities for each Tier III school identified in the district's application.
- As appropriate, State-level Technical Assistance: Districts will allow the State to holdback sufficient funds for requested and agreed-upon State-level technical assistance and other supportive services (technical assistance providers, administration of CEE

surveys, assessment of schools' implementation of the selected reform model, state-wide professional development for schools in Tiers I and II, etc.). Requested activities may be for implementing some of the required or permissible activities noted in the intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools, improvement activities in Tier III schools, or associated district-level activities. Districts may also request that the SDE contract with external providers or other services which may be purchased through the SDE.

- **Renewal:** Depending on continued federal funding, successful applicants may renew their SIG grants for up to two additional one-year periods of funding (2012-13 and 2013-14). To be eligible for renewal, districts will be accountable for ensuring (1) their Tier I and Tier II schools meet, or demonstrate a positive trajectory toward meeting annual student achievement goals for all students and for subgroups in reading and mathematics, as well as for making progress on the leading indicators; and (2) their Tier III schools are meeting annual goals (subject to approval by SDE) outlined in their improvement plans.

Note: In their application, districts are required to include a timeline of activities for implementing intervention(s) in Tier I and Tier II schools and improvement activities in Tier III schools they are applying to serve. In their timeline, districts should include activities in Year 2 (2012-13) and Year 3 (2013-14) which are essential to sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. The three-year proposed budget which districts are required to provide in their applications should also reflect the expectation for building capacity for sustainability to avoid “funding cliffs” and to ensure reforms will continue into 2014-15 and beyond. **Additionally, districts will not be penalized for (i.e., not earn points during the review and scoring process) opting not to include pre-implementation activities.**

Sample Annual District Allocation Model: The table below provides a sample of how a district might plan to allocate funds in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for one year.

Total # of Schools in Each Tier	Total # of Schools District Applies to Serve	Possible Award	Proposed Budget	Total Proposed Annual Budget
2	2	Between \$50,000 and \$2 million per school	School A (population of <250): \$150,000 School B (population of between 250-500): \$250,000	\$400,000
1	1	Between \$50,000 and \$2 million per school	School C (population of greater than 1,000) \$750,000	\$750,000

11	5	Between \$50,000 and \$2 million per school	\$250,000 (No Tier I or Tier II schools in districts, choosing to serve 5 Tier III schools)	\$250,000
----	---	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

In the event funding for the grants is reduced or eliminated, or if program requirements are changed, the Idaho SDE will collaborate with districts to modify applications.

TIMELINE

The timeline for the SIG Application process follows:

Districts will be notified of eligibility within one week of the State's SIG application being approved by the US Department of Education (USED). As part of the notice of eligibility, a copy of the LEA application will be provided (i.e., the Directions for LEAs, the Application for LEAs, and the Scoring Rubric) via email notification to eligible LEAs. Interested LEAs should send a Statement of Interest to Steve Underwood (sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov) as soon as possible or within 5 business days of notification of the state's approval.

Within one week of receiving approval by the USED, the Idaho SDE will:

- Post the final and approved State application for the FY 2010 School Improvement Grant 1003(g), including any amendments that were necessary. This posting will include the list of schools in each of the three tiers.
- Select a date for the submission of District Applications (to be within approximately 60-90 days of receiving approval from USED).
- Select a date for and schedule a two hour webinar and invite all eligible districts with Tiers I and II schools to participate, with the purpose of explaining the intervention models and application process (to be within approximately 30-40 days of receiving approval from USED). The webinar will go over:
 - i. The State's Application for 1003(g) funds
 - ii. Brief description of the PLA identification process
 - iii. Brief description of the required intervention model choices
 - iv. District Application due date
 - v. Directions to LEAs for the District Application
 - vi. The application process for LEAs (**applications should be sent electronically to Steve Underwood at sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov**)
 - vii. The Scoring Rubric used by reviewers
 - viii. The method for receiving technical assistance for the application process.
 - ix. Post-approval processes and expectations
- Select and schedule training for both reviewers and technical assistance providers.
- Establish dates for proposal reviews (to be within approximately 90-100 days of receiving approval from USED).
- Establish date for award announcements (to be within approximately 100-115 days of receiving approval from USED). Successful District SIG Awardees will be notified by Superintendent Luna.

- Allocated funds will be available to successful applicants immediately after award announcements.
- Approved applications will be posted to SDE's web site within 48 hours of award announcements.
- Districts will begin any planned pre-implementation processes upon approval and through August 2011.

Districts and Tier I and II schools will begin implementation of selected intervention models as of the beginning of the 2011-12 school year.

WHO SHOULD APPLY?

Districts that submit applications must be willing to implement one of the four specified intervention models in identified Tier I and Tier II schools, and provide improvement activities and services in identified Tier III schools. Districts must also be willing to provide evidence of strong commitment as defined in the instructions. Finally, districts must be willing to participate in assessment, data collection, evaluation, and other activities described in the Assurances in the School Improvement Grant application.

WHAT WILL BE EXPECTED OF THE DISTRICT?

In the Application Process:

Districts must submit their completed School Improvement Grant Application electronically to Steve Underwood by the deadline provided within the Notification of Eligibility. Districts are required to complete the following actions prior to submitting their application:

- Identify Participating Schools: Only Title I schools and Title I-eligible secondary schools identified by the SDE as a Tier I, Tier II or Tier III school may be served by SIG funds. In its application, each district will identify school(s) it will apply to serve and demonstrate capacity to do so; the district may decide it can best impact student achievement by focusing on a subset of its eligible schools.
- Conduct a School-level Needs Assessments for Identified Tier I and Tier II Schools: Districts must complete a needs assessment for each Tier I and Tier II school the district is applying to serve. The assessment is intended to assist the district in identifying the intervention model appropriate to each school. Districts may request technical assistance from the SDE in conducting the needs assessment. **While Focus Visits will be required as part of SIG monitoring after the LEA application is approved, prior to submitting an application, a district may also request an optional Focus Visit as a process for determining the best match.** The Focus Visit will include classroom observations focusing on instructional practices within the school and interviews with instructional staff. The observation tool and interview protocols align with the WISE Tool as well as the *Nine Characteristics of High Performing School* (Shannon & Blysmas, 2007). District-level practices and policies should be reviewed as part of the needs

assessment to identify potential barriers in district policy/practices that may impede the district's ability to implement a particular model in a Tier I or Tier II school.

- **Engage Stakeholders:** The application process also requires the engagement of relevant stakeholder groups, including local trustees and employee associations. It will be essential to collaborate with local education associations on the matter of personnel evaluations and assignments within the specified intervention models.

Additionally, the State requires the following actions on behalf of the LEA to demonstrate and ensure that there is continued capacity to effectively and fully implement the reform models.

- The LEA must establish a district level Leadership Team that provides oversight and technical assistance to each Tier I and Tier II school. Participants should include federal programs, special education, curriculum director, superintendent, local trustee, parent, and others as appropriate. The district Leadership Team shall create a district improvement plan in the State's online planning tool (the WISE Tool district level indicators), and its capacity to lead the reform effort will be judged based upon the quality of that plan.
- The LEA must identify a district level liaison (i.e., an internal lead partner **who is a central office employee**) for each Tier I and Tier II school who is accountable for the school's outcome. **For example, this may be a district turnaround specialist.**

Throughout the Duration of the Grant:

- **Implement Intervention Models in Tier I and Tier II Schools:** Participating districts must implement selected intervention model(s) with strict fidelity, per federal regulations. Federal intervention models include: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, and Transformation. Detailed requirements for each of the four specific school intervention models are available on pages 65650-65655 of the *Final Notice* at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>.
- **Support School Improvement in Tier III Schools:** Districts must support school improvement activities and services identified in the SIG application at the school or district level for each participating Tier III school.
- **Participate in On-going Assessment and Data Collection:** Assurances require districts to use the SDE online planning tool (WISE Tool) for posting intervention plans and providing ongoing evidence of implementation and impact of intervention efforts. Data include, but are not limited to, findings from needs assessments and analyses, classroom walk-through summary data, student and classroom assessment data and interventions, evidence of collaboration, and progress toward leading indicators and other measures of performance. Details regarding leading indicators are available on page 65656 of the *Final Notice* at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>. Additionally, participating districts can expect on-site monitoring **including, but not limited to, the Focus Visit process**, and technical assistance visits to verify successes and address challenges associated with implementation of the grant.
- **Hold Tier I and Tier II Schools Accountable:** Districts must hold their Tier I and Tier II schools served with SIG funds accountable each year for meeting, or being on track to

meet, achievement goals in reading and mathematics with respect to all students and each subgroup of students, and for making progress on leading indicators.

- Hold Tier III Schools Accountable: Districts must hold their Tier III schools served with SIG funds accountable each year for meeting improvement goals (subject to approval by SDE).
- Participate in Required Evaluations: Districts and participating schools are required to take part in any federally or state (Education Northwest) required evaluations of the School Improvement Grant.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE FROM SDE

As a support to districts choosing to apply for SIG funds, the SDE will offer external District-level technical assistance and instruction in the use of the online strategic planning tool. The same tool will be used for posting school intervention plans and providing ongoing evidence of implementation and impact of intervention efforts. If your district is interested in receiving technical assistance related to the WISE Tool, contact Dr. Lisa Kinnaman, Director of Statewide School Improvement Programs, at lisakinnaman@boisestate.edu.

In addition LEAs may use any of the planning tools included in the District Improvement Guide created by Boise State University's Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies (Appendix A-1).

Four Federal Intervention Models

There are four intervention models defined in federal guidance for School Improvement Grants: **Turnaround**, **Transformation**, **Closure**, and **Restart**. A district must agree to implement fully and effectively one of these interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the district commits to serve.

The **Closure model** does not require any of the components below, but does require that students are sent to other higher-achieving schools in the district.

The **Restart model** requires the district to convert the low-achieving school to a charter school, or to turn the school over to an education management organization (EMO), which is a non-profit or for-profit organization that provides whole school operation services to a district. If the district is interested in converting the school to a charter school they should contact Michelle Clement Taylor at the SDE, mtaylor@sde.idaho.gov. A description for Charter School Developers and Authorizers can be found on the SDE's web site, http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/. If the district chooses to turn the school over to an EMO, the selection process must be rigorous and thorough. A restarted school must enroll, within grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

Any of these models are open to LEAs within Idaho and we encourage district leaders to research all of them before making a selection. We have gathered feedback from district leaders that suggest that most LEAs are considering either the Turnaround or Transformation Model. Highlights of Required Activities and Permissible Activities for the **Turnaround model** and **Transformation model** are described below. A **Turnaround model** may implement any of the Required Activities or Permissible Activities described in the **Transformation model**.

KEY:

X = Required

O = Permissible

Teachers and Leaders	Turnaround	Transformation
Replace the principal.	X	X
Use locally adopted competencies to measure effectiveness of staff who can work in turnaround environment; use to screen existing staff and select new staff.	X	
Screen all existing staff, rehiring no more than 50%.	X	
Implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for recruiting, placing, and retaining effective teachers.	X	X
Implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals which are developed with staff and use student growth as a significant factor.	O	X
Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice, have not done so.	O	X
Provide additional incentives to attract and retain staff with skills necessary to meet the needs of the students (e.g., bonus to a cohort of high-performing teachers placed in a low-achieving school).	O	X
Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal, regardless of teacher's seniority.	O	O

Instructional and Support Strategies	Turnaround	Transformation
Use data to select and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned to each grade and state standards.	X	X
Provide staff ongoing, high quality, job-embedded professional development aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff.	X	X

Instructional and Support Strategies	Turnaround	Transformation
Ensure continuous use of data (e.g., formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students.	X	X
Institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.	O	O
Conduct periodic reviews to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity, having intended impact on student achievement, and modified if ineffective.	O	O
Implement a school-wide “response to intervention” model.	O	O
Provide additional supports and professional development to teachers to support students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.	O	O
Use and integrate technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.	O	O
Secondary Schools: Increase graduation rates through strategies such as credit recovery programs, smaller learning communities, etc.	O	O
Secondary Schools: Increase rigor in coursework, offer opportunities for advanced courses, and provide supports designed to ensure low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework.	O	O
Secondary Schools: Improve student transition from middle to high school.	O	O
Secondary Schools: Establish early warning systems.	O	O

Learning Time and Support	Turnaround	Transformation
Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time. Increased learning time includes longer school day, week, or year to increase total number of school hours.	X	X
Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and support for students.	X	O Note: Guidelines indicate school may partner with parents and community organizations to provide these services

Learning Time and Support	Turnaround	Transformation
Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	O	X
Extend or restructure the school day to add time for such strategies as advisories to build relationships.	O	O
Implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline.	O	O
Expand program to offer pre-kindergarten or full day kindergarten.	O	O

Governance	Turnaround	Transformation
Adopt a new governance structure to address turnaround of school(s); the district may hire a chief turnaround officer to report directly to the superintendent.	X	O
Grant sufficient operational flexibility (e.g., staffing, calendar, and budget) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement and increase high school graduation rates.	X Note: Guidelines indicate <i>Principal</i> is granted operating flexibility.	X Note: Guidelines indicate <i>School</i> is granted operating flexibility.
Ensure school receives intensive ongoing technical support from district, state, or external partners.	O	X
Allow the school to be run under a new governance agreement, such as a turnaround division within the district or state.	O	O
Implement a per-pupil school based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.	O	O

NOTE: Examples of new schools which may be implemented in **Turnaround model** or **Restart model** include theme-based academies, such as STEM or dual language.

Permissible Pre-Implementation Activities and Expenditures

An LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds for pre-implementation activities to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds.

A team of reviewers at the Idaho SDE, located within the Division of Student Achievement & School Improvement, will evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable by ensuring there is alignment between the activity carried out and the intent and requirements of the selected intervention model. As part of the application review and approval process reviewers will evaluate an LEA's proposed budget and activities with respect to activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period. This review will occur as part of the regular application approval process using the scoring guide (Attachment 5) that will be used with LEA applications.

Pre-implementation budget considerations reviewers will evaluate are the following:

- Determining whether or not the budget falls within the parameters of the LEA's first-year SIG grant, which may be no less than \$50,000 and no more than \$2 million.
- Examining the reasonableness and necessity of the budgeted amounts and whether or not the proposed activities align with the implementation requirements of the intervention model that will be used in the 2011-12 school year.
- Evaluating whether or not the LEA has been thoughtful and deliberate in planning for such things as:
 - The budgeted amount covers not only the pre-implementation activities but also the first-year activities required as part of the intervention model.
 - The budgeted amount directly relates to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, addresses the needs identified by the LEA, and advances the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in its identified schools.

Pre-implementation activities considerations reviewers will evaluate are the following:

- Are the proposed LEA activities to engage families and the community in preparation for the intervention model allowable?
- Are the proposed LEA activities to conduct a rigorous review of external providers allowable?
- Are the proposed LEA activities related to staffing allowable?
- Are the LEA proposed activities for providing instructional support programs to the students in the school allowable?
- Are the LEA proposed activities for professional development and support allowable? For example, are the funds being used for such things as:

Examples of Permissible Pre-Implementation Activities:

The following are examples of permissible SIG-related activities that may be carried out in the 2010–2011 school year in preparation for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year. As such, they are possible activities that an LEA may carry out using SIG funds in the spring or summer prior to full implementation and should not be seen as exhaustive or as required. Rather, they illustrate possible activities, depending on the needs of particular SIG schools:

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- **Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity; or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.
- **Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.
- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- **Piloting an evaluation system for teachers and principals at schools receiving SIG funds to implement a transformation model:** An LEA may use SIG funds to pilot the rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that are required in schools implementing the transformation model. To meet the requirements of the transformation model, the pilot evaluation system must take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance, on-going collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement, and high school graduation rates. The pilot evaluation system must also be designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. Although an LEA might want to establish and implement a teacher and principal evaluation system that includes all teachers and principals within the LEA, SIG funds may not be used for district-wide activities. However, prior to launching a district-wide teacher and principal evaluation system, an LEA may use SIG funds to pilot the system for teachers and principals only at schools that are being served with SIG

funds to ensure that the system is a useful tool that operates as intended. Similarly, an LEA may use SIG funds to support the salaries of evaluators who, as part of the LEA's preparation to fully implement an intervention model, observe and evaluate teachers in schools that are receiving SIG funds to begin implementing an intervention model at the beginning of the 2011–FY 2010

- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools. In general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities.

In sum, the Idaho SDE will evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period by holding them up against the intent and requirements of the selected intervention model as indicated within the Final Requirements and as further explained and clarified in the FY 2010 SIG Guidance. Pre-implementation activities will be deemed allowable to the degree that they specifically support the required components of the model and to the degree which they are supplemental and do not supplant non-Federal funds.

Questions

For questions regarding the application process, intervention models, requirements, permissible pre-implementation activities, or any other School Improvement Grant inquiries, please contact:

Steve Underwood
 Director, Statewide System of Support
sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov
 (208) 332-6922 (office)

Attachment 4: LEA Application for School Improvement Grants

**LEA Application for School Improvement Grants
1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)**

District Application

The School District's Superintendent, School Board Chair, Title I Director, Fiscal Manager, must all certify that they have read and understand 1) the SIG Assurances and 2) the ARRA Assurances and assure that the information in this application is accurate.

Application Date: _____

Superintendent Name

Signature

School Board Chair Name

Signature

Title I Director Name

Signature

Fiscal Manager Name

Signature

DIRECTIONS:

LEAs are strongly encouraged to read the **LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants** before completing this application (see [Attachment 3](#)). Please answer questions as thoroughly as possible. Applications with missing information will not be considered for funding.

I. ASSURANCES AND WAIVERS

By signing the application, the LEA is agreeing to the following assurances. The LEA application must also include any appropriate waivers requested on the next page.

Assurances

The LEA assures that it will:

- ☐ Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- ☐ Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- ☐ If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- ☐ Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements in the state Grant Reimbursement Application.

Assurances Specific to the Title I ARRA Funds

General Requirements	The district will meet all regular Title I, Part A program assurances.
ARRA Goals	Use ARRA Title I, part A funds to align with the cores goals of the ARRA to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save and create jobs; • Advance student achievement through school improvement reform consistent with Title I; • Ensure transparency,, reporting and accountability; and • Invest one-time ARRA funds in ways that do not result in unsustainable continuing commitments after the funding expires.
Reporting Requirements	Follow all regulations and reporting requirements that are specific to ARRA Title I, Part A, including the requirements for allowable costs in OMB Circular AS-87 and subject to the audit requirements in Circular A-133 as distributed by the United State's Department of Education.

Waivers

The district named in this application requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement.

The LEA believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Note: The Idaho State Department of Education has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds. This waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

- ☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

The LEA assures that it will ensure that any school that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

The LEA assures that it will implement the waiver(s) only if the school receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver(s) in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The LEA assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the Idaho Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each school implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each school is implementing.

II. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Districts must include the following information for each school it will serve with a SIG Grant.

Building Name	Grades Served (e.g. K-6)	NCES ID#	Student FTE	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Intervention (Tier I and II only)

III. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

The following questions correspond to the Federal Guidelines for the Grant. Districts may also want to review the Scoring Guide that will be used to evaluate the District SIG applications.

Instructions:

Districts applying to serve Tier I and Tier II Schools: Respond to questions 1-6 completely, applications with incomplete answers will not be considered for funding.

Districts applying to serve Tier III schools: Respond to question 7 completely; applications with incomplete answers will not be considered for funding.

1a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District has committed to serve, describe the process of determining the appropriate intervention model for each school. Include **any proposed pre-implementation activities and** the results of the needs assessment (CEE Survey, Focus Visits, input from Capacity Builders, student achievement data) in the description.

1b. Provide evidence that the district has the capacity to use the SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school in order to fully and effectively implement the required activities of the intervention model selected (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation).

2a. Is the district applying to serve each Tier I school identified by the state?

YES ☐

NO ☐

If the answer is **NO** please answer question 2b.

2b. Explain why the district lacks the capacity to implement a school intervention model and is choosing not to serve each Tier I school with the SIG funds. Include the name of each Tier I school not served.

3a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to design and implement the intervention model consistent with final School Improvement Grant requirements. The District must provide **any proposed pre-implementation activities and** detailed school-by-school information linked to specific interventions. **If the LEA intends to select external partners beyond those already approved by the State, describe the rigorous review process that will be used to recruit, screen, and select such partners to ensure they are of high quality.**

3b. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the District and the Student Achievement and School Improvement Division of the Idaho State Department of Education, or a designated external provider.

3c. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain **any proposed pre-implementation activities and** the actions the District has taken (or will take) to align other new and existing resources to fully implement the reform model.

3d. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain **any proposed pre-implementation activities and** the actions the District has taken (or will take) to modify its practices or policies if necessary and enable its schools to fully and effectively implement the reform model.

3e. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District will take to sustain reforms once the funding period ends.

4. Provide a timeline that delineates **any proposed pre-implementation activities and** the steps the District will take to implement the basic elements of the selected reform model in each Tier I and Tier II school. The timeline should indicate that the District has the ability to implement the basic elements of the model during the **2011-2012** school year. **The timeline must explicitly delineate all key elements that are required to be in place at the beginning of the school year (e.g., replacing the principal, selecting a CMO or EMO, etc.).**

5a. Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessment in reading and mathematics that the District has established to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG Grants. At a minimum, the goal for maintaining the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the prior year's ISAT (Spring 2010) should be 95%. Given the significance of the reform model and the infusion of funds districts should set aggressive but realistic goals for increasing the percentage of below basic students to basic, and basic to proficient. If the targeted Tier I or Tier II school is a secondary school, the district should also include annual goals related to increasing graduation rate particularly among specific subgroups of students that have traditionally higher dropout rates.

ANNUAL GOALS READING *(as measured by ISAT)*

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

ANNUAL GOALS MATH *(as measured by ISAT)*

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

ANNUAL GOALS SCIENCE *(as measured by ISAT)*

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

5b. Describe how the District will use interim and/or formative assessments as well as other indicators (attendance, discipline referrals, referrals to special education, Title I, classroom grades, etc.) to determine if students are making progress toward the annual goals established by the District.

6. Describe how, as appropriate the District has consulted with relevant stakeholders (School Board Members, Personnel Associations, Building Leadership Teams, Parents, etc.) regarding the District's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. **Delineate any proposed pre-implementation activities as such.**

7a. Describe how the district will hold each Tier III school receiving SIG funds accountable for meeting the student achievement goals the school (and district) established. (Goals are subject to approval by the SDE.)

7b. Describe how the District will address ESEA requirements in each identified Tier III school in corrective action or restructuring based on the 2010-2011 state assessment data. In other words how does the SIG application impact the identified needs in the corrective action or restructuring plan?

7c. For each Tier III school the District commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the improvement activities the school will implement. These services may be provided by the District, or with the approval of the District, by the District and Student Achievement School Improvement Division of the SDE, or external providers. Include the timeline for providing these services and activities.

- The following is a list of potential services for provided by the SDE to schools in all Tiers. Please note that for schools in Tier I and Tier II, participation in these state sponsored activities would be in addition to adopting a selected reform model (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) and does not replace the school level requirements for each intervention model. Check the boxes below indicating, for the district and schools, the State sponsored services in which the district intends to participate:

<i>State Sponsored Improvement Activities</i>	YES	NO
District Level Supports		
• The Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Instructional Core Focus Visit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Network of Support for Trustees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Network of Support for Superintendents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Network of Support for Central Office Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School Level Supports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Network of Support for Principals (Principals Academy of Leadership)	*	*
*Provide by name a list of schools that will or will not participate:		
School (add additional rows if needed)	YES	NO
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Descriptions of State Sponsored Improvement Activities

Idaho Building Capacity Project (IBC)

IBC provides scaffolded support by distinguished educators for three years to both under-achieving schools and their local district leaders. In the first year, the school and the central office receive the services of a trained, distinguished educator for 30 visits (averaging 8-10 hours per week); in the second year the support decreases to an average of 15-20 hours a month, and in year three, 8-10 hours a month, with the focus on sustainability. We believe that if capacity builders had the benefit of the data collected from a focus visit, the result in terms of student achievement could be faster and more impactful, but with that said, the results of the program are impressive. One of our two pilot districts, Caldwell went from no school meeting AYP to six out of 10 meeting AYP in the first year of the program. The second district had a school on the verge of restructuring which met AYP for the first time in five years. Both school districts had already implemented many improvement programs, but they are quick to attribute much of their success to the value of an executive coach to their administrative team during the implementation of change.

Instructional Core Focus Visits

Research and experience have taught us the value of catalyzing conditions (capacity, incentives, and opportunity). Catalyzing conditions begin with an event that raises the level of concern within an LEA. Using Title I-A school improvement funds, we have piloted one type of event – a focus visit. But Idaho has not had the resources to bring the program to scale. While many states have a state team that provides guidance, our focus visits are different. They are research-based and include an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Prior to the visit, we conduct a complete analysis of both student achievement (gap analysis) and perceptual data. Once on site, we conduct observations of all classrooms (using an adapted version of the Patterns of Practice) and interview at least half the instructional staff using a standard response protocol. We conduct focus groups with students, teachers, parents, and non-instructional staff, in each of the schools within the LEA and based on the triangulation of data collected from the various sources, we make recommendations to the district on the areas of strength and areas for improvement. The process is expensive and time consuming, but we know it works and we have the student achievement data to demonstrate its effectiveness. In the few districts where we have been able to pilot the strategy, we have seen a marked difference in both student achievement and strategic planning. A focus visit can be the first step in the process of transforming an LEA.

Network of Support for Trustees

The rural nature of our state and the history of local control serve as evidence that local school board trustees are critical to reform efforts. On average, Idaho school board members' tenure is 17 years. As Delagardelle (2007) stated, *"Quality school board functioning is central to the effectiveness of schooling. In fact, the effectiveness of school board governance is the single most important determinant of school district success or failure."* Idaho is in the process of creating a network of support that provides tools that Trustees need in relation to their role in district and school improvement.

Network of Support for Superintendents

Idaho has great leaders. Regrettably the geography of our state makes it difficult to collaborate on a regular basis. The SDE recognized this problem and researched alternatives. With the counsel provided by the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII), the Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) at the University of Washington, Boise State University's Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies and the Department of Education of the State of Kentucky, we formed the Idaho Superintendents' Network in August 2009. The superintendents have met five times during this academic year. The meeting is facilitated by the Center for Educational Leadership (University of Washington) and is based on their research (funded through a grant from the Wallace Foundation) of the impact of central office staff on quality instruction. We will require that all of the leaders in districts with schools in Tier I and II participate.

Network of Support for Central Office

In early 2009, we read an article written by Meredith Honig and Michael Copland that discussed their research on the central office staff's role in supporting school improvement. The article was so compelling that we contacted Dr. Honig and Dr. Copland, met with them last spring and asked them to partner with us to provide this type of information to Idaho leaders. Their research focused on urban areas, but we believe the same information is valuable to rural school districts in our state. In Idaho, we've learned that sometimes you need to go slow to go fast so we collectively decided to focus our efforts on district leaders (superintendents) during the 2009-2010 school year to build their knowledge base and establish a statewide sense of community among these leaders. Dr. Michael Copland and Dr. Sandy Austin from the University of Washington are facilitating our Idaho Superintendents' Network.

Boise State University's (BSU) Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies has also agreed to partner with the SDE. BSU wants their involvement to both inform their administrator preparation program and help the SDE improve the services. The program is showing early signs of success; however, in the process of creating the network, we exhausted our Title I-A school improvement funds. 1003(g) funds would allow us to expand the program to central office staff. LEAs with schools in Tier I and II would have this as a requirement and LEAs in Tier III would be invited to participate. The group will follow the same systemic process as our superintendents' network but focus on the central office staff's role in improving the quality of instruction.

Network of Support for Principals (Principals Academy of Leadership – PALs)

The success of the Principal Academy of Leadership (PALs) project was the impetus for the Idaho Superintendents' Network. It brings principals struggling to meet the needs of all learners together to discuss their roles in advancing student outcomes. Participation will be a requirement for leaders of Tier I and II schools but we would like to offer the same opportunity to building leaders of schools in Tier III. Each school agrees to participate in instructional reviews (onsite observations of instruction), which consist of observations of each classroom using a research-based tool. While the emphasis of improvement is on math and science, the ultimate goal is to increase the leadership capacity of each principal.

IV. BUDGET

A district must include a proposed budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the district will expend in each year and for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. (Successful grantees will receive full funding in year one of the SIG grant. Additional funding will be dependent on the success of the implementation and the continued support of federal funds.)

The budget should include a summary of proposed funding amounts and a narrative explaining how the district will allocate SIG funds over a maximum 3-year period (until the end of the period of availability). A separate budget table should be created for each school the district intends to serve and the funding should be consistent with both the timeline provided by the LEA for implementation and support required activities. (Guidance for budgets is included in the **LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants**, [Attachment 3](#).)

- A. Ensure that the budget for each school served falls within the parameters of the SIG final requirements, which may be no less than \$50,000 and no more than \$2 million per year over no more than three years. Pre-implementation expenses that are requested must be delineated as such in the budget narrative and included as part of the Year 1 budget request. Pre-implementation expenses must also be permissible and aligned with the selected intervention model.
- B. Complete the Budget Summary Table below. Include the following:

- Subtotal of expenditures by grant categories and budget categories, with subtotals of proposed budget amounts for the district and each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school for a maximum of three years (through September 30, 2014).
- Total budget amount for each school and for the district (through September 30, 2014).
- Descriptions should include name of each school, its Tier, and the total proposed budget for that school each year.
- **Ensure that all proposed expenditures are permissible.** Ensure that no prohibited expenses are included. For example, construction, such as structural alterations to buildings, building maintenance, or repairs, is specifically prohibited according to 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c).

In addition to cumulative information, provide individual proposed budget amounts and a narrative indicating how the district will allocate SIG funds through the period of availability, with separate detailed budget narratives for the district and each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the district is committing to serve.

C. Complete the Budget Narrative below. The budget must provide sufficient funding for the following activities:

- Implement the selected intervention model and its requirements (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) in each Tier I and Tier II school
- Conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the district's Tier I and Tier II schools. **Such district-level activities must be described in a budget narrative that is specific to the district office and separate from the school-level budget narrative.**
- Support improvement activities at the school or district level for each Tier III school identified in the district's application.

As appropriate, include state-level expenses associated with technical assistance and other support services required or requested and agreed upon by the Idaho SDE and district. Requested activities may be for implementing intervention models in Tier I or Tier II, improvement activities in Tier III schools, or associated district-level activities. Districts may also contact the SDE about contracting for either external providers or services. **Selection of external providers that are not pre-approved by the SDE will be evaluated based on the criteria set in Section B, Part 2 (2), of the SEA Application.**

BUDGET SUMMARY

(Attach a separate budget for the district as a whole and each school being served.)

School Name: _____

Tier (select one):

Tier I☐

Tier II☐

Tier III☐

		Teachers/Leaders			Instructional/Support			Learning Time			Governance			SUBTOTALS		
	BUDGET CATEGORIES	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1	Personnel															
2	Fringe Benefits															
3	Travel															
4	Equipment															
5	Supplies															
6	Contractual															
7	Other															
8	Total Direct Costs															
9	Indirect Costs *															
10	Training Stipends															
11	Total Costs															
											TOTAL BUDGET: \$					

BUDGET NARRATIVE

Attach a separate budget narrative for each part of the organization. In other words, include a budget narrative that delineates funds to be used at the district office and a separate budget narrative for each school being served. The number of Budget Narrative forms that are to be submitted will thus be equal to the number of schools listed under *Section II: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED* plus one, for any expenses at the district office.

District Name: _____

School Name: _____

Tier (select one): I ☐ II ☐ III ☐**1. Personnel****Category Narrative**

Teachers/Leaders:

Instructional and Support:

Learning Time:

Governance:

Year 1 Subtotal:	\$	Year 2 Subtotal:	\$	Year 3 Subtotal:	\$	Category Subtotal:	\$
---------------------	----	---------------------	----	---------------------	----	-----------------------	----

2. Fringe Benefits**Category Narrative**

Teachers/Leaders:

Instructional and Support:

Learning Time:

Goverance:							
Year 1 Subtotal:	\$	Year 2 Subtotal:	\$	Year 3 Subtotal:	\$	Category Subtotal:	\$

3. Travel

Category Narrative							
Teachers/Leaders:							
Instructional and Support:							
Learning Time:							
Goverance:							
Year 1 Subtotal:	\$	Year 2 Subtotal:	\$	Year 3 Subtotal:	\$	Category Subtotal:	\$

4. Equipment

Category Narrative							
Teachers/Leaders:							
Instructional and Support:							
Learning Time:							
Goverance:							
Year 1 Subtotal:	\$	Year 2 Subtotal:	\$	Year 3 Subtotal:	\$	Category Subtotal:	\$

5. Supplies

Category Narrative							
Teachers/Leaders:							
Instructional and Support:							
Learning Time:							
Governance:							
Year 1 Subtotal:	\$	Year 2 Subtotal:	\$	Year 3 Subtotal:	\$	Category Subtotal:	\$

6. Contractual

Category Narrative							
Teachers/Leaders:							
Instructional and Support:							
Learning Time:							
Governance:							
Year 1 Subtotal:	\$	Year 2 Subtotal:	\$	Year 3 Subtotal:	\$	Category Subtotal:	\$

7. Other

Category Narrative							
Teachers/Leaders:							
Instructional and Support:							

Learning Time:							
Goverance:							
Year 1 Subtotal:	\$	Year 2 Subtotal:	\$	Year 3 Subtotal:	\$	Category Subtotal:	\$

Attachment 5: Scoring Guide for LEA Application

**1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Scoring Guide for District Application**

District: _____

Reviewer # _____

Tier I and Tier II Schools: _____

Tier III Schools (if applicable): _____

Directions to Reviewers:

Each application will have at least two reviewers: reviewers are not to compare scores. Follow these steps when scoring each application:

Read and score each section of the application using the Scoring Guide to determine whether the section does not meet standards, meets standards, or is an exemplary plan.

- All districts must complete: Assurances, Certification, Section A: Schools to be Served and Section C: Budget.
- Districts applying to serve Tier I or Tier II schools must respond to Questions 1-6. LEAs that are proposing to use funds for a pre-implementation period must articulate them as such and do so according to the guidelines given in the **LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants** (Attachment 3). Reviewers must determine when providing a score for each section of the rubric whether or not any proposed pre-implementation budget and activities are permissible.
- Only districts applying to serve Tier III schools must respond to Questions 7a-7c.
- Districts must not be penalized for (i.e., not earn points during the review and scoring process) opting not to include pre-implementation activities.

Enter the scores at the bottom of each section and in Points Awarded. The total for each application will be computed separately. In addition to rating the section provide comments if you rated the section as “Does Not Meet Standards.” Districts may be asked to revise their applications and resubmit them if they are serving schools in Tiers I or II.

After scoring the application, please summarize in the space below at least two strengths and one area that you feel could be strengthened. The scoring rubrics will be shared with districts if requested.

Strengths (at least two):

Weakness (at least one):

SCORING GUIDE

Question/Section	Points Possible	Points Awarded	Meets Standards Y/N	Total
I. Assurances	Required	Required	N/A	Required
II. Schools to be Served	Required	Required	N/A	Required
III. Descriptive Information				
1a: Selection of Reform Model	0-5			
1b: District Capacity	0-5			
2a. Applying to serve each Tier I school	0-5			
2b. Explanation of lack of district capacity (if applicable)	0-5			

Question/Section	Points Possible	Points Awarded	Meets Standards Y/N	Total
3a: Actions to implement model	0-5			
3b: Actions to provide ongoing technical assistance				
3c: Actions to align resources				
3d: Actions to modify practices or policies				
3e: Actions to sustain reforms				
4: Timeline	0-5			Required
5a: Annual Goals	0-5			Required
5a: Dropout Rate (if applicable)	0-5			
5b: Interim Assessments	0-5			
6: Stakeholder Involvement	0-5			
Budget	Required	N/A	N/A	Required.
			Total Points	

COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING TABLE FOR DISTRICTS ONLY APPLYING TO SERVE SCHOOLS IN TIER III

Question/Section	Points Possible	Points Awarded	Meets Standards Y/N	Total
7a: Tier III Accountability	0-5			
7b: Tier III and ESEA Requirements	0-5			
7c: Tier III Services	0-5			
IV. Budget	Required	N/A	N/A	Required
			Total Points	

Having reviewed the district's proposal how ready to do you think the district is to make significant changes within the school(s)? How significant is the change proposed by the district? Please refer to specifics within the application, as well as demographics of the applying school district (size, location, district and build level staffing, prior involvement in state sponsored support).

What additional questions do you have for the district?

SECTION III: DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

1a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District has committed to serve, describe the process of determining the appropriate intervention model for each school. Include **any proposed pre-implementation activities and the results of the needs assessment (CEE Survey, Focus Visits, input from Capacity Builders, student achievement data) in the description.**

- Does the district's application include a thorough analysis of the four intervention/reform models?
- Does the proposal describe why the particular model was selected?
- Does the application make reference to the Center for Educational Effectiveness Survey?
- Have they had or have they requested a Focus Visit?
- Does the selection of a reform model reflect a thorough analysis of student level achievement?
- Does the proposal take seriously the achievement of specific subgroups (Native American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilities)?
- Has the district articulated how the proposed model will positively impact student outcomes?
- Are there multiple measures (interim and formative assessments)?
- Does the proposal include teacher qualifications and placement?
- Does it include information on their current school improvement plan?
- Has the district either converted to the WISE Tool (online Strategic Planning Tool) or are they committing to do so for the coming school year?
- Has the district consulted relevant stakeholders (trustees, personnel associations, parents, community members)?
- **Are there any pre-implementation activities identified and do they align with the selected intervention model?**

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

1b. Provide evidence that the district has the capacity to use the SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school in order to fully and effectively implement the required activities of the intervention model selected (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation).

- **Required:** Has the LEA established a district level Leadership Team that provides oversight and technical assistance to each Tier I and Tier II school including participants, such as federal programs, special education, curriculum director, superintendent, local trustee, parent, and others as appropriate?
- **Required:** Has the district Leadership Team created a high quality district improvement plan in the State's online planning tool (the WISE Tool district level indicators)?
- **Required:** Has the LEA identified a district level liaison (i.e., an internal lead partner) for each Tier I and Tier II school who is accountable for the school's outcome?
- Does the district refer to any of the research practices provided by the Center on Innovation and Improvement (Distributed through the State Wide System of Support) such as:
 - Toolkit for implementing School Improvement Grant: Transformation Model
 - Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants
 - Exploring the Pathway to Rapid Improvement
 - Breaking the Habit of Low Performance: Successful School Restructuring Stories
 - Megasytem
- Has the district participated in any of the State Sponsored Technical Assistance Opportunities (Superintendents' Network, Idaho Building Capacity, PALs, School Improvement Webinars, Instructional Leader Series)?
- Does the application refer to the Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools?
- Does the proposal explain ways the district has or will reform current policies to support the reform model?
- Have they developed a method to differentiate resources (fiscal, human) across the district?
- Does the proposal describe the method of principal and teacher selection and placement?
- Does the proposal explain the ways in which the district has (or will) address the needs and provide support to Tier I and Tier II Schools?
- Does the proposal include a list of resources (fiscal, leader and teacher assignment, professional development)?
- Does the application include evidence of local board commitment?
- Does it provide a timeline and process to build sufficient central office and school-level administrative leadership?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

2a. Is the district applying to serve each Tier I school identified by the state?

Yes ___ No ___

If the answer is yes skip to responses for question 3a. If the answer is “no” score the responses to 2b.

2b. Explain why the district is choosing not to serve a Tier I school with SIG funds. Include the name of the school.

(Please note that the district may not demonstrate that it lacks capacity to serve Tier I schools if it is intending to serve Tier III schools.)

- Is it a lack of teacher talent (highly qualified, advanced degrees, demonstrated success in accelerating achievement)
- Is it due to a lack of qualified administrators?
- District’s ability to recruit and retain sufficient number of staff?
- Infrastructures within the district (lack of RTI system, non-alignment of curriculum, lack of assessments)
- District has determined that intervention in a Tier II school may be more impactful than intervening in a Tier I school
- For the closure model, access and proximity to higher-performing schools.

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to design and implement the intervention model consistent with final School Improvement Grant requirements. The District must provide **any proposed pre-implementation activities and detailed school-by-school information linked to specific interventions. If the LEA intends to select external partners beyond those already approved by the State, describe the rigorous review process that will be used to recruit, screen, and select such partners to ensure they are of high quality.**

(Note to Reviewers: Districts were instructed to use the Center on Innovation and Improvement's publication Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners. Because each of the models is different, be sure to also identify the following features:

- *the model selected and then follow the appropriate rubric has been inserted in the district folder provided by the SDE*
- *if pre-implementation activities are indicated under this section, if they are permissible, and if they align with the selected intervention model*
- *if the LEA intends to select external partners beyond those already approved by the State, the application describes the rigorous review process that will be used to recruit, screen, and select such partners to ensure they are of high quality*

Transformation

Required:

- Has the principal been replaced? (If the principal is new to the school within the last 2 years, the principal may remain as principal if the district has implemented "in whole or part" the required elements of the selected model.
- Has the district implemented such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for hiring, placing and retaining effective teachers?
- Does the proposal indicate the implementation of rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals? In addition to employing the Danielson Framework, does the evaluation take into consideration student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, ongoing collection of professional reflecting student achievement and increased graduation rates?
- Does the plan Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice, have not done so?

Transformation

- Does the proposal use data to identify and adopt an instructional program that is research-based and aligned to state standards both vertically and across classrooms?
- Does the proposal identify professional development that is ongoing, job-embedded and aligned to identified needs?
- Has the district ensured the continuous use of student data (formative, summative, diagnostic) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet academic needs?
- Has the district established schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all subjects?
- Does the plan include providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community involvement?

Permissible:

- Provide additional incentives to attract and retain staff
- Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal
- Partnerships with parent organizations and faith based organizations, health clinics, other state/local agencies
- For secondary schools, credit recovery programs
- Use and integrate technology-based interventions
- Provide additional professional development to teachers to support students with disabilities and English language learners
- Establishment of early warning systems (attendance, discipline referrals, grades, homework, participation)
- Implement a school-wide response to intervention model
- Adopt a new governance structure
- Implement a new school model (themed, dual language academy)
- Implement a per-pupil based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Other factors to consider:

- How will the LEA select a new leader and what experience, training, competencies will the new leader be expected to have?
- How will the LEA enable the new leader to make and sustain strategic staff replacements?
- What is the LEA's capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required and permissible strategies?
- What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting and scheduling must accompany the transformation?
- How will the changes be brought about and sustained?

Transformation

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

Turnaround**Required:**

- Has the district replaced the principal? (If the principal is new to the school within the last 2 years, the principal may remain as principal if the district has implemented “in whole or part” the required elements of the selected model.
- Has the district used a locally adopted measure to assess the competencies of staff who can work in the turnaround school? The assessment must be to screen all existing staff and select new staff, rehiring no more than 50%.
- Does the district’s application demonstrate that they will implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for hiring, placing and retaining effective teachers?
- Does the proposal use data to identify and adopt an instructional program that is research-based and aligned to state standards both vertically and across classrooms?
- Does the proposal identify professional development that is ongoing, job-embedded and aligned to identified needs?
- Has the district ensured the continuous use of student data (formative, summative, diagnostic) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet academic needs?
- Has the district established schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all subjects?
- Has the district included appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and support for students?
- Has the district adopted a new governance structure to address turnaround schools? (The district may hire a chief turnaround office to report directly to the superintendent.)

Turnaround

- Does the district's plan provide the principal with sufficient operating flexibility in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting to fully implement comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates?

Permissible:

- Implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. For example, in addition to employing the Danielson Framework, evaluation takes into consideration student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, ongoing collection of professional reflecting student achievement and increased graduation rates.
- Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice have not done so.
- Provide additional compensation to attract and retain staff, such as bonus to recruit and place a cohort of high performing teachers together in a low achieving school.
- Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
- Partner with parent, faith based, and other community based organizations such as health clinics, or other state/local programs.
- Extend the school day to provide such strategies as advisories built into the school day.
- Implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline.
- Expand program to offer pre-kindergarten or full day kindergarten.
- For secondary schools:
 - Increase graduation rate through strategies such as credit recovery.
 - Improve student transition from middle to high school
 - Increase rigor in coursework
 - Offer opportunities for advanced courses
 - Provide supports to ensure that low-income students can take advantage of these programs
 - Establish early warning systems (attendance, discipline referrals, grades, homework completion)
- Institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.
- Conduct periodic reviews to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity, having intended impact on student achievement and modified if ineffective.

Turnaround

- Implement a school-wide response to intervention model
- Provide additional professional development to teachers to support student with disabilities and English language learners.
- Use and integrate technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.
- Ensure school receives intensive ongoing technical support from district, state, or external providers (CBs)
- Implement a new school model (themed, dual language academy)
- Implement a per pupil school based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Other factors to consider:

- How will the LEA select a new leader and what experience, training, competencies will the new leader be expected to have?
- How will the LEA enable the new leader to make and sustain strategic staff replacements?
- What is the LEA's capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required and permissible strategies?
- What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting and scheduling must accompany the transformation?
- How will the changes be brought about and sustained?

Turnaround

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

School Closure**Required:**

- Has the district established a plan and timeline for school closure with closure to occur before the beginning of the 2011-12 school year?
- Has the district identified other higher performing schools within reasonable proximity to schools being closed?
- Does the district have a plan for supporting the students in the new schools?

School Closure

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

Restart**Requirements:**

LEAs have the option of either restarting the school as a charter school or selecting an external educational management organization (EMO). The EMO may be either a non-profit or for profit entity.

- If the district intends to close the school and restart it as a Charter School, have they provided evidence of having accessed information from Michelle Clement Taylor, School Choice Coordinator?
- Has the district accessed information provided on the State Department of Education's website for charter school developers and/or authorizers? (http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/authorizers.htm)
- If the district intends to enter into an agreement with EMO do they have a clear and delineated process for selecting an EMO?
- Has the district compiled a pool of potential EMOs?
- Does the district describe the process they will use to vet each of the EMOs?
- Has the district assured that all former students who wish to attend the restarted school will be granted permission to attend the restarted school?
- How will the district monitor the performance of the EMO?

Restart

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3b: For each Tier I and Tier II school the district is applying to serve, explain action the District has taken or will take to ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive support from the District, the Idaho Statewide System of Support or a designated external technical assistance provider.

- Does the proposal describe how the district has determined which external technical assistance providers it has chosen to work with the school?
- Is there a plan for providing technical assistance to the district as it changes policies and procedures that may impede implementation of the selected reform model?
- Does the application describe the types of data the district used to select the provider?
- What specific qualifications is the district looking for? How well is that articulated in the grant?
- How did the district work with the SDE in selecting the provider? (Is it a consultant provided through the Idaho Building Capacity Project?)
- Does the proposal describe an evaluation process which will be used to monitor supports and services provided to the school by both the LEA and external partners?
- Does the application describe the involvement of stakeholders in the selection process?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3c: For each Tier I and Tier II school the district is applying to serve, explain **any proposed pre-implementation activities and actions the District has taken, or will take to align other resources to fully and effectively implement the reform model?**

- Does the proposal include other local, state, or federal financial resources that will be used to implement the reform model?
- Has the district reached out to other community members to provide support to the school(s). Community members might include health clinics, local law enforcement agencies, library, institutes of higher education, other state and local agencies.

- Is there a plan for continuously reviewing the allocation of resources to ensure implementation and sustainability of the program.
- Will data be collected on the coordination of resources?
- Are pre-implementation activities indicated under this section, are they permissible, and do they align with the selected intervention model?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3d. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain any proposed pre-implementation activities and the actions the District has taken (or will take) to modify its practices or policies if necessary and enable its schools to fully and effectively implement the reform model.

- Has the district reviewed current practices and policies which either support or impede reform efforts?
- Is there a timeline for the review of current practices (if not completed)?
- Is there a process for annual review and revision of board policies and procedures?
- Has the district researched processes and policies related to recruiting and retaining highly effective leaders and teachers? (Issues related to the master contract, collaborative discussion related to local competency based assessment of teaching practices, competitive salaries and benefits)
- Does the proposal explain how communication will be intentional and frequent between the superintendent, district leaders and staff in participating schools.
- Are pre-implementation activities indicated under this section, are they permissible, and do they align with the selected intervention model?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3e. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District will take to sustain reforms once the funding period ends.

- Does the proposal describe system-wide infrastructures the district has developed or will develop to sustain reforms in Tier I and II schools? For example:
 - Board adopted policies and practices, and supports for Tier I and II schools to sustain changes and innovations
 - Tools, systems, and practices supporting the use of data to inform district, school, and classroom decision making
 - Process of delivering collaboratively determined, job-embedded professional developed
 - Calendar and schedule which provide extended learning time
 - System for continued horizontal and vertical curriculum alignment
 - Budget which uses federal, state, and local education funding to sustain reforms
 - Narrative describing the process for differentiating resources to sustain reform efforts
 - Decision making practices at the district and school levels which provide for stakeholder involvement and input in sustaining changes, innovations, and a continuous improvement process.

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

4. Provide a timeline that delineates **any proposed pre-implementation activities and the steps the District will take to implement the basic elements of the selected reform model in each Tier I and Tier II school. The timeline should indicate that the District has the ability to implement the basic elements of the model during the 2011-2012 school year. **The timeline must explicitly delineate all key elements that are required to be in place at the beginning of the school year (e.g., replacing the principal, selecting a CMO or EMO, etc.).****

- Does the proposal include a three-year timeline for implementing the selected reform model in each Tier I and Tier II school?
- Does the timeline include the basic (required) elements will be in place during the coming **(2011-2012)** school year?
- Does the timeline allow for certain basic elements to be revisited (job-embedded professional development, identifying and rewarding principals and teachers who have increased student achievement) to occur later in the process of implementing the model?
- **Are pre-implementation activities indicated under this section, are they permissible, and do they align with the selected intervention model?**

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

5a. Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessment in reading and mathematics that the District has established to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG Grants. At a minimum, the goal for maintaining the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the prior year's ISAT (Spring 2011) should be 95%. Given the significance of the reform model and the infusion of funds districts should set aggressive but realistic goals for increasing the percentage of below basic students to basic, and basic to proficient. If the targeted Tier I or Tier II school is a secondary school, the district should also include annual goals related to increasing graduation rate particularly among specific subgroups of students that have traditionally higher dropout rates. The district should also set specific goals for each at-risk subgroup (low-income, Hispanic, Native American, students with disabilities, English language learners).

ANNUAL GOALS READING *(as measured by ISAT)*

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

ANNUAL GOALS MATH *(as measured by ISAT)*

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

ANNUAL GOALS SCIENCE *(as measured by ISAT)*

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

5b. Describe how the District will use interim and/or formative assessments as well as other indicators (attendance, discipline referrals, referrals to special education, Title I, classroom grades, etc.) to determine if students are making progress toward the annual goals established by the District.

- Does the proposal include interim assessments for every content area measured on ISAT?
- If not what is the plan for creating assessments?
- Does the district have a comprehensive assessment plan (screening, progress monitoring, diagnostic, summative)?

- If the Tier I or II school is a secondary plan are college and career bound assessments part of the comprehensive assessment plan?
- Is there a timeline for collecting and analyzing the assessment data?
- How is the data shared with teachers?
- How frequently is it shared?
- In what manner is it shared (professional learning communities, grade level teams, emails, departmental meetings)?
- How is the information shared with parents?
- How are formative assessments used to improve instruction?
- How are students identified as “at-risk”?
- Are pre-implementation activities indicated under this section, are they permissible, and do they align with the selected intervention model?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

6. Describe how, as appropriate the District has consulted with relevant stakeholders (School Board Members, Personnel Associations, Building Leadership Teams, Parents, etc.) regarding the District’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Delineate any proposed pre-implementation activities as such.

- Does the application include input from relevant stakeholders? For example:
 - A variety of two-way communication models (survey, focus groups) which were used to gather input during the application process
 - Describes how the input was utilized in the application process

- Does the proposal include a timeline for regular communication with stakeholders
- Does the proposal describe how stakeholder input will be sought and used during the implementation process
- Are pre-implementation activities indicated under this section, are they permissible, and do they align with the selected intervention model?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

FOR DISTRICTS APPLYING TO SERVE TIER III SCHOOLS

(NOTE THE IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION MAY ONLY FUND TIER III SCHOOLS AFTER ALL TIER I AND II ARE FUNDED)

7a. Describe how the district will hold each Tier III school receiving SIG funds accountable for meeting the student achievement goals the school (and district) established. (Goals are subject to approval by the SDE).

- Does the proposal describe which data will be used to measure progress?
- Does the application include student achievement data (beyond ISAT) including interim and formative assessments
- Does the application include on observation-based assessments of instruction and alignment to professional development (if funds are requested)
- Has the District described technical assistance and other resources which will be utilized to train teachers and leaders to implement and analyze interim assessments and other indicators of progress.
- Does the application describe additional resources if any, which will be provided to implement interim assessments and/or interventions?
- Does the proposal describes process to reassess current and/or provide additional resources (human, fiscal) if the school is not meeting or on a positive trajectory to meet annual goals?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

7b. Describe how the District will address ESEA requirements in each identified Tier III school in corrective action or restructuring based on the 2010-2011 state assessment data. In other words how does the SIG application impact the identified needs in the corrective action or restructuring plan?

- Does the application specifically address ESEA requirements for schools in corrective action or restructuring?
- Does the application name each of the Tier III schools and in its year of improvement?
- Are the identified schools the most in need of improvement within the district?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

7c. For each Tier III school the District commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the improvement activities the school will implement. These services may be provided by the District, or with the approval of the District, by the District and Student Achievement School Improvement Division of the SDE, or external providers. Include the timeline for providing these services and activities.

- Does the proposal request funds for professional development for teachers to support Native American, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners or other at-risk populations?
- Is the funding request aligned to the identified needs cited in the School Improvement Plan?
- Is the improvement effort sustainable beyond the SIG Grant?
- Does the proposal include participation in any of the state sponsored technical assistance initiatives such as:
 - Idaho Building Capacity
 - Superintendents Network
 - Focus Visits
 - Central Office Staff Network
 - Principals Academy of Leadership
 - Network for Board Members
 - Professional Development related to Online Strategic Planning Tool (WISE)
 - Response to Intervention
 - Positive Behavior Intervention Support

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

SECTION IV: BUDGET

A district must include a proposed budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the district will expend in each year and for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. (Successful grantees will receive full funding in year one of the SIG grant. Additional funding will be dependent on the success of the implementation and the continued support of federal funds.)

The budget should include a summary of proposed funding amounts and a narrative explaining how the district will allocate SIG funds over a maximum 3-year period (until the end of the period of availability). A separate budget table should be created for each school the district intends to serve and the funding should be consistent with both the timeline provided by the LEA for implementation and support required activities. (Guidance for budgets is included in the **LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants**, [Attachment 3](#).)

- A. Ensure that the budget for each school served falls within the parameters of the SIG final requirements, which may be no less than \$50,000 and no more than \$2 million per year over no more than three years. Pre-implementation expenses that are requested must be delineated as such and included as part of the Year 1 budget request. Pre-implementation expenses must also be permissible and aligned with the selected intervention model.
- B. Complete the Budget Summary Table below. Include the following:
- Grand Total of expenditures by grant categories and budget categories, with subtotals of proposed budget amounts for the district and each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school for a maximum of three years (through September 30, 2014).
 - Total budget amount for each school and for the district (through September 30, 2014).
 - Descriptions should include name of each school, its Tier, and the total proposed budget for that school each year.
 - **Ensure that all proposed expenditures are permissible.** Ensure that no prohibited expenses are included. For example, construction, such as structural alterations to buildings, building maintenance, or repairs, is specifically prohibited according to 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c).

In addition to cumulative information, provide individual proposed budget amounts and a narrative indicating how the district will allocate SIG funds through the period of availability, with separate detailed budget narratives for the district and each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the district is committing to serve.

NOTE to Reviewers: Fill in this summary table of the LEA Budget proposal.

Building	Tier	Model	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
District	N/A	N/A				
School 1						
School 2						
School 3						
		Totals:				

C. Complete the Budget Narrative below. The budget must provide sufficient funding for the following activities:

- Implement the selected intervention model and its requirements (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) in each Tier I and Tier II school
- Conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the district's Tier I and Tier II schools. **Such district-level activities must be described in a budget narrative that is specific to the district office and separate from the school-level budget narrative.**
- Support improvement activities at the school or district level for each Tier III school identified in the district's application.

As appropriate, include state-level expenses associated with technical assistance and other support services required or requested and agreed upon by the Idaho SDE and district. Requested activities may be for implementing intervention models in Tier I or Tier II, improvement activities in Tier III schools, or associated district-level activities. Districts may also contact the SDE about contracting for either external providers or services. **Selection of external providers that are not pre-approved by the SDE will be evaluated based on the criteria set in Section B, Part 2 (2), of the SEA Application.**

NOTE to Reviewers

Check and provide comments for the following:

- Does the application include budget narratives that separate out expenses for each part of the organization? In other words, are there separate budget narratives for the district office and each school being served?
- Are proposed expenses permissible?
- Do the expenses in the budget narratives add up and align with those provided in the budget summary?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

Attachment 6: Evidence of Public Notice and Comment Period

Evidence of Public Notice and Comment Period

Idaho provided public notice in the following ways.

1. The Title I Committee of Practitioners was notified via an email (Artifact A) dated November 19, 2010. The following attachments were provided:
 - a. Memorandum_to_LEAs_FY10SIGWaivers.pdf – the memo sent to LEAs
 - b. SIG 1003g Requested Waivers.pdf – the list of requested waivers
 - c. IdahoSIG_App_FY10-Attachments.docx – the attachments for the State SIG Application
 - d. IdahoSIG_App_FY10-Application.doc – the body of the State SIG application
 - e. sigguidance11-01-2010.pdf – the federal guidance document for SIG
2. An email (Artifact B) dated November 19, 2010, and titled ***Memo Regarding Public Comment*** (Artifact C) was sent to all LEAs with a formal memo attached titled ***School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) Waivers for FY 2010*** (Artifact D).
3. The same memo and and list of waivers were posted publicly on the State's website on November 19, 2010, at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/ssos/grant.htm> (Artifact E), where they may still be found.

The artifacts for each of the above are found below. No public comment was received.

Artifact A

From: Cheryl Kary
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2010 3:07 PM
To: Fernanda M. Brendefur; roger.brown@dfm.idaho.gov; scaywood@nsd131.org; dunbl@d55.k12.id.us; Cheryl Engel; Colleen Fillmore; Marybeth Flachbart; wendi.forrey@boiseschools.org; idleginfo@Iso.idaho.gov; mhaberman@lewistonschools.net; harwooja@d25.k12.id.us; fhuffman@cdaschools.org; Matt Hyde; gajohnston@vallivue.org; kayj@sd381.k12.id.us; Kaufman.mary001@gmail.com; lisakinnaman@boisestate.edu; gmlowe@sd232.k12.id.us; dmakley@rcdb.org; meyeandr@isu.edu; lsoweb@Iso.idaho.gov; odellpa@tfsd.k12.id.us; wendyroldekamp@msn.com; WPARRET@boisestate.edu; rosiesantana@boisestate.edu; Karen J. Seay; searles@d93.k12.id.us; nicoles@familyadvocate.org; Ann Stephens; Mary Lou Wells
Cc: Marcia M. Beckman; Steve Underwood; Shasta Bruce
Attachments: Memorandum_to_LEAs_FY10SIGWaivers.pdf; SIG 1003g Requested Waivers.pdf; IdahoSIG_App_FY10-Attachments.docx; IdahoSIG_App_FY10-Application.doc; sigguidance11-01-2010.pdf
Importance: High

Dear Title I Committee of Practitioners,

The Department of Education is preparing to submit its state application for funding for the FY 2010 School Improvement Grant Fund from Section 1003(g) of the ESEA. As part of the application process, we want to consult with you and gain any input that you may have regarding the grant application. The timeline for submission is fairly tight, and since we will not be having an in person meeting with you before the grant is due, we are soliciting your feedback via email. Attached, you will find the SIG guidance from the USDoE, the draft application materials, the draft attachments to accompany the actual application, the waivers being sought, and the memo that was just sent to superintendents throughout the state. If you have any feedback, input, or comments that you would like for us to consider, please send them to Shasta Bruce (at sbruce@sde.idaho.gov) no later than November 24, 2010.

Best regards,

Steve Underwood
 Director, Statewide System of Support
 Division of Student Achievement & School Improvement
 Idaho State Department of Education
 208-921-6802 (mobile)
 208-332-6922 (office)
sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov

Cheryl Kary
 NCLB Programs
 Idaho State Department of Education
 208-332-6906
cmkary@sde.idaho.gov

Artifact B

From: Steve Underwood
To: [Steve Underwood;](#)
cc: [Marybeth Flachbart; Marcia M. Beckman; Melissa R. McGrath;](#)
[Shasta Bruce;](#)
Subject: Memo Regarding Public Comment
Date: Friday, November 19, 2010 2:38:00 PM
Attachments: [Memorandum to LEAs FY10SIGWaivers.pdf](#)
[SIG 1003g Requested Waivers.pdf](#)

Dear Superintendents,

In preparing for the submission to the US Department of Education of an application for FY2010 funds through the School Improvement Grant 1003(g), the State is seeking public comment on waivers that will be requested. Please see the attached memorandum from Superintendent Luna along with the list of requested waivers, if you are interested in providing comment.

Best regards,

[Steve Underwood](#)
[Director, Statewide System of Support](#)
[Division of Student Achievement & School Improvement](#)
[Idaho State Department of Education](#)
[208-921-6802 \(mobile\)](#)
[208-332-6922 \(office\)](#)
sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov

Artifact C

MEMORANDUM

TO: Superintendents

FROM: Tom Luna, Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) Waivers for FY 2010

In preparation for the Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) to submit its application and waivers to the US Department of Education for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) for FY 2010 funds, the State is providing all interested LEAs in the state with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on our request.

Please review the attached waiver requests:

- New list waiver
- School improvement timeline waiver
- Schoolwide program waiver
- Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

This waiver request may also be found on the State website at www.sde.idaho.gov/site/ssos/grant.htm Public Comment is solicited for the period of November 19-30, 2010. Please send comments to Shasta Bruce at sbruce@sde.idaho.gov.

If you have any questions about the intent or purpose of these waivers, please contact Steve Underwood at sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tom Luna', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Tom Luna
Idaho Superintendent of Schools

Artifact D

School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) for FY 2010

WAIVERS REQUESTED OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Idaho requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

New list waiver

Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

School improvement timeline waiver

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances: The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application. The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Schoolwide program waiver

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances: The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application. The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Artifact E**Website Screen Capture**